

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. XXV, No. 100

OCTOBER 1949

## AN INTERPRETATION OF CHAUCER'S KNIGHT'S TALE

By WILLIAM FROST

IN his recent article, 'A Reinterpretation of Chaucer's Theseus' [*R.E.S.* xxiii (1947), 289-96], Professor Henry J. Webb undertakes to demonstrate that the Theseus of the Knight's Tale is more of a villain than has commonly been believed. It is his contention that Chaucer, in reworking his source material, emphasized or added to 'those traits in the character of Theseus which were ignoble or cruel'; and that the poet's frequent use of the adjective 'noble' in conjunction with Theseus's name is to be interpreted as ironic (pp. 289, 296). Part of Mr. Webb's argument is based on Theseus's actions in the Tale (his destruction of Thebes, pillaging of the Theban country-side, imprisonment of Palamon and Arcite without asking ransom, and release of Arcite without releasing Palamon); part is based on the character of Theseus as it appears in other legends about him (notably in the story of his desertion of Ariadne, which Chaucer recounts in *The Legend of Good Women*).

Mr. Webb's reinterpretation appears to me partial, misleading, and incomplete. To deal with the second class of evidence first, it is a moot question how closely the Theseus of the Knight's Tale is to be identified with the Theseus of the Ariadne story. Mr. Webb, if I understand him correctly, supposes that the Ariadne episode occurred *later* in Theseus's life than the events of the Tale; thus he says that Theseus's character 'soon suffered a change' (p. 289), and speaks of Arcite's release as having 'foreshadowed the deed which eventually damned the duke' (p. 294). But it is clear from line 980 of the Knight's Tale that the conquest of the Minotaur, which led immediately to the betrayal of Ariadne, had taken place *before* the Palamon and Arcite story. Probably long before; for in the Knight's Tale Theseus is no longer a young man [he says that he has been a lover 'ful yore agon' (l. 1813)]; while according to Chaucer's

version of the Ariadne story he was sent to Crete at the age of twenty-three (*L.G.W.*, I. 2075).

But even setting chronology aside, how closely are we to identify the Theseuses of the two stories? I would suggest that they be kept quite distinct. In the Legend of Ariadne, one more woeful tale of a woman abandoned by her lover, Chaucer is using the figure of Theseus for a purpose utterly unlike his purpose in the Knight's Tale; and, furthermore, the circumstances of the two stories are not compatible with each other if the two are taken as relating episodes in the life of the same man. Egeus, Theseus's father, drowns at the end of Chaucer's Ariadne legend (*L.G.W.*, I. 2178), probably as a kind of poetic penalty for his son's faithlessness to that heroine; but in the Knight's Tale—many years later—Egeus is still alive, though aged, and has a speaking part (ll. 2837–52). All that remains, in the Knight's Tale, of the whole Cretan business is a single passing reference to the heroic glories of Theseus's early youth.

As for Theseus's actions in the Tale, Mr. Webb reviews several of them in the light of various medieval treatises on chivalry with the object of showing that the Duke was at times an abnormally cruel and arbitrary ruler. Here his argument would have more point, I think, if Theseus were an historical English duke rather than a figure in a poem. As a figure in a poem he is entitled to be regarded first of all in the light of the full literary context in which he appears; but Mr. Webb omits entirely any consideration of such an important part of that context as, for example, Theseus's 'cheyne of love' speech (2987 ff.). When Chaucer calls his Friar 'noble' in his description of him in the Prologue (208 ff.) it is clear from the preceding lines (which have strongly implied that the Friar is a great seducer of women) that the praise is ironic; but we have no corresponding reason, in the text of the Knight's Tale itself, for interpreting the praise of Theseus in a similarly ambiguous light.

I agree entirely with Mr. Webb when he calls Theseus one of the most complex characters delineated anywhere in the *Canterbury Tales*; but for an understanding of his complexities nothing less than a review of the entire poem as an artistic unit will adequately serve.<sup>1</sup>

The labours of modern medievalists have clarified for us much of the intellectual, historical, and literary materials which went into the creation of the poem Chaucer put into the mouth of his Knight and dignified as the first of the *Canterbury Tales*. Thanks to historical scholarship we now know not only that its immediate source was in Boccaccio rather than

<sup>1</sup> A method of critical procedure similar to Mr. Webb's (namely, examination of selected parts divorced from any treatment of the poem as a whole) renders equally open to attack, in my judgement, the conclusions about the personalities of Palamon and Arcite reached recently by Professor A. H. Marckwardt (*Characterization in Chaucer's Knight's Tale*, University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, No. 5, 1947).

'Stace of Thebes and thise bookes olde' (as the Knight rather vaguely puts it) but also just what Chaucer imitated from the Italian's *Teseide*, what he left out, and where he got much of what he added. Arcite's 'maladye of Hereos' has been diagnosed by Professor Lowes with an erudition no doubt few fourteenth-century physicians could have commanded; Chaucer's use of the *Teseide* (in the Knight's Tale and elsewhere) has been related to his general development as a poet by Professor R. A. Pratt; Professor B. A. Wise has traced the inspiration of some passages in the Tale back to 'Stace of Thebes' himself; Professors B. L. Jefferson and H. R. Patch have derived many ideas in the poem from the tradition of Boethius. The mysteries of Chaucerian astrology have been clarified by Professor W. C. Curry; a number of writers have dealt with the conventions of courtly love embodied in the story; and the close relation of the military aspects of the Tale to actual fourteenth-century warfare has been established: indeed, the latest suggestion is that the tournament at the climax of the plot may have been inspired by a real tournament Chaucer probably witnessed in London.<sup>1</sup>

In short, we know something of Chaucer's experiences, library, tastes, opinions, and methods of composition; as well as, by inference, something of the point of view of his earliest audience—we can dimly imagine how it felt to read the Knight's Tale in the 1390s. But on the Tale as a tale—except for widespread comments that it is, generally speaking, a good one—much less has been written and very little agreement been reached. What may be the point of the story is frequently debated, votes having been registered for the Tale as allegory, as a riddle, as a pseudo-epic (marred by omission of too much of Boccaccio's material), and as a piece of realism (marred by an excess of epic machinery). Who should be considered the hero is even questioned, some preferring Palamon, some Arcite, others finding little to choose between them. Among these latter is Professor Root,<sup>2</sup> who feels that the descriptions (of battles, temples, May, &c.), 'with occasional passages of noble reflection', are the 'flesh and blood' of the poem, 'of which the characters and action are merely the skeleton framework'.<sup>3</sup> 'What is the Knight's Tale', he asks, 'but a splendidly pictured tapestry, full of color and motion?'<sup>4</sup> It is my purpose to attempt, in terms of the Tale itself, an answer to Mr. Root's question.

<sup>1</sup> See the notes to the Tale in *The Complete Works of Chaucer* (ed. F. N. Robinson, Cambridge, Mass., 1933), pp. 770 ff. (for Lowes, Wise, Patch, and Curry); also B. L. Jefferson, *Chaucer and . . . Boethius* (Princeton, 1917); Johnstone Parr, 'The Date and Revision of Chaucer's *Knight's Tale*', *P.M.L.A.* lx (1945), 307-24; and R. A. Pratt, 'Chaucer's Use of the *Teseida*', *P.M.L.A.* lxii (1947), 598-621, especially 613-20.

<sup>2</sup> See R. K. Root, *Poetry of Chaucer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1922), pp. 163-73. Mr. Root discriminates between the temperaments of the two knights, but concludes that 'the reader of the tale . . . is unable to decide on which he would wish the ultimate success to light' (p. 170).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 172.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37.

## I

The Knight's Tale develops from three widening concentric circles of interest: the merely human interest of the rivalry between two young heroes, both noble and both in love, for the hand of a heroine who has no apparent preference between them; the ethical interest of a conflict of obligations between romantic love and military comradeship; and finally the theological interest attaching to the method by which a just providence fully stabilizes a disintegrating human situation.

As important as the problems of the plot is the atmosphere in which they are worked out, the world of the Knight's Tale. This world, being an amalgam of legendary Athens, fourteenth-century England, and the never-never land of chivalric romance, presents to us that curious double relationship to any imaginable real world which most great art—the *Odyssey*, *Hamlet*, *Paradise Lost*, *Faust*—seems to attain; that is, a simultaneous relationship (the delight of readers and despair of historians) of nearness and distance. Anyone called 'Theseus, Duke of Athens' must surely be a classical hero refracted through a medieval lens; so we suppose, only to discover that there was a living 'Duke of Athens' at the time Chaucer wrote.<sup>1</sup> But whether classical, realistic, or chivalric, the atmosphere of the Tale has three abiding attributes: it is predominantly noble, predominantly tragic, and deeply infused with a sense of significance transcending both human beings and their material environment. In this essay I shall consider first the problems of the story, then the general characteristics of the universe in which the story happens.

## II

The problem of who shall win the hand of the fair Emelye, Duke Theseus's young sister, is intensified throughout the Knight's Tale by systematic and delicately balanced parallelism in the presentation of the rival heroes, Palamon and Arcite. At no point is either allowed to take the centre of the stage or the initiative in setting the plot in motion without the other at once having an equal opportunity. If the two knights are together they are spoken of as a pair: 'This Palamon and his felawe Arcite' (1031); if events separate them the spotlight shifts impartially from one to the other:

Now wol I stynte of Palamon a lite,  
And lete hym in his prisoun stille dwelle,  
And of Arcite forth I wol you telle. . . . (1334-6)  
. . . And in this blisse lete I now Arcite  
And speke I wole of Palamon a lite. . . . (1449-50)

Moreover, the two knights have much in common: besides being noble,

<sup>1</sup> See H. R. Patch, 'Chauceriana', *Englische Studien*, lxx (1930-31), 354 n.; cited by Robinson in a note on l. 86c.



young, and passionately in love, besides being kinsmen, compatriots, and sworn blood-brothers, they are equally valorous:

There nas no tygre in the vale of Galgopheye  
 Whan that hir whelp is stole whan it is lite,  
 So crueel on the hunte as is Arcite  
 For jelous herte upon this Palamon.  
 Ne in Belmarye ther nys so fel leon,  
 That hunted is, or for his hunger wood,  
 Ne of his praye desireth so the blood,  
 As Palamon to sleen his foo Arcite. . . . (2626-33)

If Arcite despairs at being exiled from Athens and the sight of Emelye, Palamon despairs at being still imprisoned and helpless to win her. If Palamon breaks faith with Theseus by escaping from prison, Arcite merits equal punishment for returning to Athens in disguise. At the final tourney, for which each has prepared by prayer and sacrifice to a patron deity, each is seconded by a confederate champion, warlike and exotic: Palamon by 'Lygurge himself, the grete kyng of Trace' (2129), with his white wolf-hounds; Arcite by 'the grete Emetrius, the kyng of Inde' (2156), an eagle on his wrist and tame lions and leopards all about him.

So ostensibly impartial is the presentation of the heroes, in fact, that it is no wonder that some Chaucerians—Professor Hulbert, for example<sup>1</sup>—have failed to see any significant distinction between them. The teller of the tale himself never obviously sides with one or the other; to Theseus they are an identical pair of infatuated fools; and even Emelye expresses no preference between 'Palamon, that hath swich love to me' (2314) and 'Arcite, that loveth me so soore' (2315). Finally, as the lines I have been quoting demonstrate, the concurrent stories of the two heroes are narrated in a poetry marked by all manner of rhetorical parallelism.<sup>2</sup>

I am sure myself that the heroes are significantly differentiated from each other, and that a valid preference between them is implied by the poem; but they are certainly not individualized in the manner of such rival protagonists of later storytelling as Richard II and Bolingbroke, or Dobbin and George Osborne. Much of the beauty of the Knight's Tale, and of its appropriateness to the man who tells it, resides in a certain formal regularity of design. Thus the May-songs of Emelye and Arcite, redolent of youth, freshness, and spontaneity, come at two crucial points in the plot; while early May is also the time of the final contest that will make one hero happy and the other glorious. Thus the Tale begins with a wedding, a conquest, and a funeral; and ends with a tournament, a funeral, and a wedding.

<sup>1</sup> J. R. Hulbert, 'What was Chaucer's Aim in the Knight's Tale?', *S.P.* xxvi (1929), 375 ff.

<sup>2</sup> At one point rhetorical parallelism may possibly extend beyond the two knights and bracket Palamon and Emelye: compare ll. 2212 and 2273.

## III

A conflict between love and comradeship in the hearts of the two knights is the emotional focus of the story, the poetry of which develops each of the conflicting elements as a constituent of the world in which the story takes place. Comradeship implies war: Palamon and Arcite are first introduced, side by side, 'both in oon armes', on the field of battle. Chaucer created the military elements of the poem by fusing his own knowledge of contemporary warfare with a classical tradition that stretches back through Boccaccio and Statius to the ancient Greeks. The mixture is rich, allusive, and concrete:

The rede statue of Mars, with spere and targe,  
 So shyneth in his white baner large,  
 That alle the feeldes glyteren up and down;  
 And by his baner born is his penoun  
 Of gold ful riche, in which there was ybete  
 The Mynotaur, which that he slough in Crete.  
 Thus rit this duc, thus rit this conquerour,  
 And in his hoost of chivalrie the flour . . . (975-82)

These lines are from a description of Theseus, the dominant figure of the poem and, significantly, the man who unites in his person successes in war and love alike. 'He conquered al the regne of Femenye' (866), symbolic homeland of Ypolita, Amazon queen and Theseus's bride. For neither of the two knights, it finally develops, will such a double triumph be possible; one is to have victory in battle, the other to marry Emelye.

In a drama involving conquest, tourneying, and hand-to-hand combat ankle-deep in blood, comradely loyalty is, of course, a fitting plot-motif; and the outward similarity between Palamon and Arcite enhances the violence of their rupture. They are, moreover, sworn blood-brothers—into Palamon's mouth is put a picture of the relation between them as it has been up to the beginning of the tale and ought, ideally, to continue (1129-40). Since the re-establishment of this normal, desirable, and exemplary relation is to be a part of the denouement, it is noteworthy that immediately after the break between the two knights there occurs a symbolic allusion to one of the most famous instances of fellowship in ancient legend. Scarcely have Palamon and Arcite quarrelled for the first time than Perotheus arrives in Athens and is described as follows:

A worthy duc that highte Perotheus,  
 That felawe was unto duc Theseus  
 Syn thilke day that they were children lite. . . .  
 So wel they lovede, as olde bookes sayn,  
 That whan that oon was deed, soothly to telle,  
 His felawe went and soughte hym down in helle. . . .

(1191-3, 1198-1200)

And we are reminded of a great myth celebrated in classical poetry—in Horace, for example:

... Theseus leaves Pirithōus in the chain  
The love of comrades cannot take away.<sup>1</sup>

This reference to Theseus's journey to the underworld is, by the way, one classical detail Chaucer *added* to what he took from the *Teseide*.<sup>2</sup>

Romantic love, which drives Palamon and Arcite apart, enters the poem most notably in the praise each lover accords Emelye, the illness and despair each undergoes, and Palamon's prayer in the temple of Venus. Romantic love, however, implying as it does chivalry, courts of love, and the idealization of woman, invests the figure of Theseus also. Despite his mockery of the lovers the Duke has been, he says, a 'servant' in his time. He is, moreover, a general who undertakes a new war to avenge insults done to ladies; an absolute ruler who allows his punishment of self-acknowledged culprits to be deflected by the merciful intervention of his wife and sister; a devastator of 'wall and sparre and rafter' in conquered Thebes, but also an umpire who forbids fatal bloodshed at the tournament over which he presides. Thus if the Knight's Tale develops a conflict between an ethic of battle and an ethic of love, nevertheless in the figures of Theseus, Ypolita, and Perotheus we are presented with an emblem of the two kinds of value reconciled and in accord.

We are also presented, in the minds of Palamon and Arcite, with two views of the same situation, Palamon being the spokesman of the greater idealism.<sup>3</sup> The contrast comes first in the way each regards Emelye. In Boccaccio both saw her as Venus; in Chaucer Palamon alone, in the following metaphor charged with religious overtones, makes that identification:

Venus, if it be thy wil  
Yow in this gardyn thus to transfigure,  
Bifore me, sorweful, wrecched creature . . . (1104-6)

Arcite emphatically differs, and seeks to use the difference as an argument for his own priority; he says to Palamon,

Thyn is affeccioun of hoolynesse,  
And myn is love, as to a creature . . . (1158-9)

Or, as Dryden translated the lines:

Thine was devotion to the blest above;  
I saw the woman, and desired her love. . . .

(*Palamon and Arcite*, i. 319-20)

<sup>1</sup> *Odes*, iv. 7. The translation is Housman's (*Collected Poems*, New York, 1940, p. 164).

<sup>2</sup> See B. A. Wise, *Influence of Statius upon Chaucer* (Baltimore, 1911), p. 88.

<sup>3</sup> For some aspects of the following comparison of Palamon and Arcite I am indebted to my friend Mr. Douglas Knight.

It is a conflict, not between love and love, but between devotion and desire.<sup>1</sup>

This is the first instance of a significant divergence between the rivals; a second follows at once in their attitude toward the law of comradeship. Each, naturally, cites this law as binding on the other; but it is Arcite, not Palamon, who ultimately repudiates it for them both, in the lines:

And therfore, at the kynges court, my brother,  
Ech man for hymself, ther is noon other. (1181-2)

The third and crucial divergence comes on the morning of the tournament when Arcite prays to Mars for a victory in arms which he thinks will be the means of possessing Emelye, while Palamon prays to Venus for Emelye herself.

Thus to Arcite the situation presents itself throughout as a practical problem of satisfying a desire by pursuit of the logical means to attain it. When he compares himself and Palamon, quarrelling in prison over Emelye, to the two dogs who fought over a bone till both lost it (1177-80) he resembles Theseus at the latter's most pragmatic moment (1798-1812); and on his return to Athens as Philostrate Arcite sets on foot the most elaborate scheme either lover ever conceives of to gain his object. Palamon, on the other hand, though fully as fervent as his rival, includes his passion in a wider conception of Venus-worship; and, far from prizing victory or any other means of success, puts his love for Emelye above life itself (2254-8). In thus extending beyond the grave his love resembles the devoted comradeship of Theseus and Perotheus.

Even the language used about him by the teller of the Tale distinguishes Palamon's experience from that of his comrade: his imprisonment while Arcite is free is spoken of as a 'martyrdom' (1460),<sup>2</sup> and with 'hooly herte' he makes a 'pilgrymage' to the temple of Venus (2214-15).<sup>3</sup>

It seems to me, then, that the outcome of the tale is fully justified by what has gone before—that Palamon wins Emelye because he is worthier of her, in terms of the story, than is Arcite. By this I would not imply either that Arcite is base or that the loser wins nothing; half the interest of the final solution is in the reconciliation between the two knights and

<sup>1</sup> Contrast the language of Arcite's prayer to Mars (especially the verb 'usedest'): 'For thilke hooite fir / In which thou whilom brendest for desir, / Whan that thou usedest the beautee / Of faire, yonge, fresshe, Venus free' (2383-6) with that of Palamon's prayer to Venus: 'For thilke love thou haddest to Adoon' (2224).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also line 1562, where Arcite says that Theseus 'martireth' Palamon in prison.

<sup>3</sup> By far the most interesting discussion of Palamon and Arcite I have seen in print is that of Professor H. N. Fairchild in his article 'Active Arcite, Contemplative Palamon', *J.E.G.P.* xxvi (1927), 285-93. His allegorical interpretation has been called 'somewhat forced' by Robinson in his edition of Chaucer (p. 772), and it must be admitted that several of Fairchild's comments do not seem fully warranted by the text of the poem. We have no reason to suppose, for example, that Arcite goes a-maying because he is 'stirred by the

the comments of Theseus on Arcite's fate. If it be thought that the evidence on which I have sought to make a distinction between the knights is too slender to support one, then I can plead in defence that the slightest parts of the poem are often charged with a significance only apparent in the light of the whole. When Arcite, for example, on being given his liberty complains that 'We witen nat what thing we preyen heere' (1260), his words are full of an irony (because of his later prayer to Mars) greater than his immediate circumstances presuppose.

## IV

The justice of the solution in relation to the two knights would be incomplete, however, if that solution were not brought by justifiable procedure. The course of events is determined to some extent by the knights themselves, more largely by Theseus, and ultimately by the various divinities, especially Saturn, and the supernatural power that they represent. Of the human figures in the story that of Theseus is most dominant—indeed, so much so as to seem, in comparison to Palamon, Arcite, and Emelye, almost superhuman. Theseus is both the guardian of Emelye and the legal possessor of the persons of the knights from the moment they are brought before him, more dead than alive, after the battle at Thebes. Later he releases Arcite, and Palamon escapes; but before either has had a chance to advance his cause with Emelye the Duke comes upon them and takes them prisoner again. At this point the poem implicitly associates him with the destiny and divine foreknowledge which, according to the teller of the Tale, lie behind all human events and situations:

... And forth I wolȝ of Theseus yow telle.  
 The destinee ministre general,  
 That executeth in the world over al  
 The purveiaunce that God hath seyn biforn  
 So strong it is that, though the world had sworn  
 The contrarie of a thing by ye or nay,  
 Yet sometyme it shall fallen on a day  
 That falleth nat eft withinne a thousand yeer. . . .  
 This mene I now by myghty Theseus. . . . (1662 ff.)

Theseus is the executant of destiny. On the morning of the final tourney he sits in a window of his palace overlooking the crowd and 'arrayed right as he were a god in trone' (2529). As a personality he is appropriately impressive: terrifying in action, philosophical in outlook; richly experienced

vague uneasiness of the active man' (Fairchild, *op. cit.*, p. 289), especially when the poem says that he 'litel wiste how ny that was his care' (1489). But Fairchild's article, in contrast to some other discussions of the subject, is fully alive to possible symbolic values in Chaucer's presentation of the knights.



yet detached in point of view; warmly sympathetic to misfortune<sup>1</sup> yet mockingly ironical at the expense of youthful enthusiasm. From the moment when he gives orders that the captured knights be imprisoned to the moment when he arranges the final nuptials of Emelye and Palamon he dominates the plot without ever being a partisan. Thus his pronouncements, and especially his long speech in the final scene, carry peculiar weight.

Destiny proper is represented first by the three divinities to whom the rivals, and Emelye, appeal; then by Saturn, who settles the issue among the divinities; and ultimately by a Divinity—'the sighte above' (1672), 'the Firste Moevere' (2987)—beyond all particular divinities. This ultimate godhead, 'the which is prince and cause of alle thing' (3036), is identified by Theseus with 'Juppiter'; but the conception of him given by Theseus's speech as a whole sets him significantly apart from those other representatives of the classical pantheon who figure in the Knight's Tale. These—Mars, Diana, and the rest—are as much stars as gods;<sup>2</sup> and being stars they are the particular manifestations of Fortune, or Destiny, which is the agent, ultimately, of Providence. In *Paradise Lost* the pagan deities are assimilated to Christian story by their banishment to hell as rebel angels; in the Knight's Tale they still reign in the physical heavens, but reign as deputies of a transcendent sovereign.<sup>3</sup>

## V

When the Knight had finished his Tale Chaucer records that it won the general applause of the pilgrims, and the unanimous approval of the gentlefolk among them: 'And namely the gentils everichon' (3113). This last statement we can readily believe; for the Tale is wholeheartedly aristocratic, both in subject-matter and attitude. All the principal figures are of high birth; Arcite, for example, mortified by his disguise as a poor squire, reflects on his lineage in the following lines:

Allas, ybrought is to confusioun  
The blood roial of Cadme and Amphiou, —  
Of Cadmus, which that was the firste man  
That Thebes built, or first the toun bigan,  
And of the citee first was crowned kyng.  
Of his lynage am I and his ofspryng  
By verray ligne, as of the stok roial. . . . (1545-51)

<sup>1</sup> I take his imprisonment of the two knights without asking ransom to be simply part of the *donnée* of the story as it came to Chaucer—and not, without further explanation of motive than the poet gives us, an implication that Theseus lacks chivalry.

<sup>2</sup> See W. C. Curry, *Chaucer and the Medieval Sciences* (Oxford, 1926), chapter vi.

<sup>3</sup> The position of 'Juppiter' is made ambiguous by his brief appearance during the quarrel between Venus and Mars, of which it is said that 'Juppiter was bisy it to stente' (2442); Saturn finally resolves the strife. In the light of the poem as a whole it appears that Saturn is the logical deity to devise the catastrophe which causes Arcite's death; and the passage in question need not be taken to imply either that Saturn is superior in power

Theseus represents the full exercise of a sovereignty the material prerogatives of which are made, at several points, very explicit. 'Ful lik a lord' the Duke rides to the lists through a city which is said to be 'Hanged with clooth of gold, and nat with sarge' (2568-9). For the building of the temples beside the 'noble theatre' he has employed all the architects and artisans in the country, regardless of expense: the temple of Mars 'coste largely of gold a fother' (1908). The limitlessness of his wealth is initially apparent when he demands no ransom for his royal prisoners—a circumstance so remarkable in dukes that it is referred to more than once.

Even persons who appear only briefly in the action are of rank: the suppliant Theban women at the beginning of the poem are all duchesses and queens. Even disguised as Philostrate, a mere hewer of wood and bearer of water, Arcite

... was so gentil of condicioun

That thurghout al the court was his renoun. (1431-2)

The recurrent occasions of life for people of such condition as this are ceremonious, their actions at such times being imbued with the piety of ancient ritual. Arcite, even though he has rejected the code that binds him to his blood-brother, insists on returning to Athens, after finding the escaped Palamon, for food and weapons for his rival. The poem as a whole presents in affectionate detail three major ceremonial events: the prayers at the temples, the elaborate formalities of the tournament, and Arcite's funeral. Even the period of mourning for Arcite is apparently of prescribed duration (2967-8).

The action takes place, then, in an idealized aristocratic universe, magnanimous, munificent, and ceremonial. Theseus is the ideal conquering governor, Palamon the ideal lover, Emelye the emblem of vernal innocence. The story ends, too, with its ideal lover at last

... in alle wele

Lyvyng in blisse, in richnesse, and in heele. ... (3101-2)

Yet the view of the universe taken by the Tale is a tragic view, and the condition of man presented by the teller is also tragic.

The most direct, simple, and uncompromising expression of this tragic view comes in the words of Egeus, Theseus's father, after the accident to Arcite proves fatal. Egeus (who makes only this single brief appearance in the story) has been taken by some critics for a dotard; however that may be, his speech, of which I will quote the final lines, has central importance:

This world nys but a thurghfare ful of wo,

And we been pilgrymes, passynge to and fro.

Deeth is an ende of every worldly soore. (2847-9)

to the divine disputants or that Jupiter was, or would have been, unable to settle matters. Nothing in the passage seems inconsistent with the idea of Saturn representing one aspect, or agent, of Jupiter's omnipotence.

The sentiment is a commonplace, of course, which could doubtless be matched, if not duplicated, a thousand times in the literature of Chaucer's age and of preceding periods; it nevertheless has power in the Knight's Tale because that poem, although its plot is concerned with success in love and its setting pictures aristocratic splendours, presents on the whole such an abiding and various image of 'every worldly soore'. Man, the teller might be saying, whatever his station in life, is the victim of arbitrary, cruel, and often ironical mischance. The Theban ladies are summarily widowed by civil wars; Thebes sacked by Athens; the knights jailed by Theseus; while noble Arcite slowly and painfully dies of a fall from his horse because, nature having abandoned him, medicine is consequently useless—

And certainly, ther Natur wol nat wirche,  
Fare wel phisik! go ber the man to chirche! (2759-60)

It is not only the events of the story which provide a rich reference for Palamon's bitter questioning of the 'cruel goddes' in the following lines:

What is mankynde moore unto you holde  
Than is the sheep that rouketh in the folde?  
For slayn is man right as another beest  
And dwelleth eek in prison and arreest,  
And hath siknesse and greet adversitee. . . . (1307-11)

As tragically impressive as the events I have mentioned is the image of the human condition implied by the great descriptions of the temples of Venus, Mars, and Diana (especially by that of Mars) and by the speech of Saturn detailing his own influence on mortal affairs. These passages, among the most admired in Chaucer, are generally treated as set-pieces, in detachment from context. Actually they are an organic part of the Tale, for they symbolically extend the misfortunes and griefs of the central characters and at the same time provide a background against which these same misfortunes and griefs will seem less extraordinary. This extension supports the view of human life taken by Egeus and Palamon in the lines I have just quoted, and by Arcite and Theseus in lines I shall presently discuss.

The picture of the temple of Venus refers, it is true, to both the delights and the sorrows she causes; but it begins and ends with the sorrows—'ful pitous to biholde'—and it emphasizes the follies of lovers: 'the folye of kyng Salomon. . . . The riche Cresus, kaytyf in servage' (1942, 1946). The temple of Diana, which represents innocence and a kind of divine beneficence and is associated with Emelye, is described more naïvely as a collection of wonders merely; but even here the most vivid pictures are of the hounds devouring Actaeon 'for that they knewe hym naught' (2068), and of a woman in the throes of a difficult childbirth. The images inspired by

Mars and Saturn give an inclusive and uncompromising panorama of existence as a moral hell and a cosmic chaos. The sow devours the baby 'right in the cradel' (2019); the man-eating wolf rends his victim at the foot of Mars's statue, to the glory of the god; the glance of Saturn is 'the fader of pestilence' (2469); images of manslaughter, arson, suicide, treason, murder, and rapine make up the decorations of Mars's temple.

This last edifice is built like a dungeon, as the following lines show:

The dore was al of adamant eterne,  
Yclenched overthwart and endelong  
With iren tough; and for to make it strong,  
Every pyler, the temple to sustene,  
Was tonne greet, of iren bright and shene . . . (1990-4)

Imprisonment is a symbol of great importance to the poem; it is significant that Arcite's long-desired release from captivity leads first to exile and then despair, then to a strenuous life of practical expedients crowned by illusive victory and sudden death. His epitaph is spoken by Theseus (the original prisoner of the knights) in these words:

. . . goode Arcite, of chivalrie the flour,  
Departed is with duetee and honour  
Out of this foule prisoun of this lyf. . . (3059-61)

For Arcite release from prison has been no more than escape into a larger prison, until the final release of death. 'What is this world?' asks the dying knight, whom devices and expedients can help no longer—

What is this world? What asketh men to have?  
Now with his love, now in his colde grave  
Allone, withouten any compaignye? (2777-9)

But although the picture of 'this world' implied by the Mars and Saturn passages is chaotic and hideous enough, such a view of human existence is by no means the total effect left by the Knight's Tale. To begin with, the very presence of the gods, whether astrological or theological, gives a degree of order and significance to the lives of mortals. A trio of divinities accounts for the misery of Palamon: as Palamon puts it,

. . . I moot been in prisoun thurgh Saturne,  
And eek thurgh Juno, jalous and eek wood,  
That hath destroyed wel ny al the blood  
Of Thebes with his waste walles wyde;  
And Venus sleeth me on that oother syde  
For jalousie and fere of hym Arcite. (1328-33)

And a conflict of divinities accounts for the death of Palamon's rival. Nothing exists in this human world but has its source, significance, and

guidance from above—a kind of guidance symbolized most concretely by the traditional device of Mercurie's appearance to advise Arcite to go to Athens. Thus the very vicissitudes of life fall into an ultimate pattern decipherable by wisdom and philosophy; even the destructive divinities are still divine.

More important still, beyond these destructive divinities governs the *Firste Moevere* of Theseus's final elegy. This speech is the climax of the poem. Here Theseus sets forth in general terms what the particulars of the story have been leading to. Human decay and corruption (the accident to Arcite, the violence and pestilence symbolized by Mars and Saturn, the follies in which Venus has a share) proceed under the laws of an ultimate Providence, which has fixed a term to the existence of finite things. Man's proper wisdom is not to cry out against the 'faire cheyne of love' which binds the universe, but nobly to accept his destiny—to 'take it weel . . . that to us alle is due' (3043-4). Hence the importance of Arcite: his nobility, his education, his tragedy. His death was not meaningless to him since it empowered him to reassert his proper relation to Palamon and to do his friend the service he might have done at the beginning. As Theseus says,

. . . And certainly a man hath moost honour  
To dyen in his excellence and flour,  
When he is siker of his goode name;  
Thanne hath he doon his freend, ne hym, no shame. (3047-50)

And after Arcite's funeral, the decent period of mourning, and Theseus's elegy, stability can be established by the harmonious union of Emelye and Palamon, who incidentally represent the formerly warring countries, Thebes and Athens.

## VI

Such a tale is clearly suited to the Knight of Chaucer's prologue who tells it, a man of high rank, wide travel, and ingenuous loyalty to the ideas of his class and age. The lessons of the Tale, if such they may be called, imply a pious and logical mind in the instructor, a deep acceptance of Christian faith and chivalric standards, and an heroic disposition to face the vicissitudes and disasters of a dangerous calling. That they had been faced in fact we have been assured by the prologue:

At Alisaundre he was whan it was wonne.  
Ful ofte tyme he hadde the bord bigonne  
Aboven alle nacions in Pruce;  
In Lettow hadde he reysed and in Ruce,  
No Cristen man so ofte of his degree.  
In Gernade at the seege eek hadde he be  
Of Algezir, and riden in Belmarye,



At Lyeys was he and at Satalye,  
 Whan they were wonne; and in the Grete See  
 At many a noble armee hadde he be. (51-60)

To present the mind and heart of this Knight is an important function of the Tale. Though hardly a dramatic monologue in the Shakespearian or Browningsque sense of the term, the Tale is nevertheless a dramatic utterance both externally (in the light of its setting) and internally. Scarcely has the Knight finished his story of Palamon and Arcite, and won the applause of all the pilgrims (especially of the gentlefolk), than the drunken Miller is pushing forward, interrupting the Host's attempted introduction of the Monk as second narrator, and insisting loudly on *his* tale instead. The Miller's Tale (as everyone knows) is perhaps the most elaborate improper story in English literature—the most elaborate and in many ways the grossest. It represents an artistic antithesis to the Knight's Tale, being also a tale of the rivalry of two suitors for a young woman. But whereas Palamon and Arcite worshipped the maiden Emelye with an introspective ardour that seemed almost its own reward, Nicholas and Absolon pursue the lickerish Alisoun for the simple object of cuckoldry just (to use Chaucer's simile) as a cat pursues a mouse. Instead of the international and even cosmological background of the Knight's Tale, the scene of the Miller's Tale is small-town, domestic, and bourgeois. Its plot embodies a kind of crude justice meted out by circumstances both to successful and to attempted adultery. The manners of chivalry are burlesqued in the figure of the genteel parish-clerk-and-barber Absolon; while Christianity enters the story as a ready means of duping an illiterate and credulous husband. The contrast to the Knight's Tale could hardly be more complete. It is as if the Miller, growing more and more restive in the moral stratosphere as the leisurely Knight's Tale winds to its ceremonious and philosophical conclusion, were unable to keep silent after the Knight's final words about the young couple:

For now is Palamon in alle wele,  
 Lyvyng in blisse, in riches, and in heele,  
 And Emelye hym loveth so tendrely,  
 And he hire serveth al so gentilly,  
 That nevere was ther no word hem bitwene  
 Of jalousie or any oother teene. . . . (3101-6)

What a picture of married life! The Miller will show that there is another side to *that* story!—

By armes, and by blood and bones,  
 I kan a noble tale for the nones,  
 With which I wol now quite the Knyghtes tale (3124-6)  
 says the Miller.

The Miller's Tale, then, is the principal external means by which the Knight's Tale is made dramatic and given a certain artistic distance both from the reader and from the poet of the *Canterbury Tales*. There are also internal and ironical means of accomplishing the same object, and they are fully employed. I refer, of course, to such occasions as when Theseus remarks that the lover who loses Emelye may as well 'go pipen in an yvy leef' (1838); or when the women of Athens (with all the sensibilities of modern cinema addicts) lament the death of Arcite because, as they put it, he had 'gold ynough, and Emelye' (2836); or when the species of trees that make up Arcite's funeral pyre are listed with no more ceremony of adjective than it is now customary to give the names in a telephone directory. The very ingenuousness of the Knight as a commentator on his own story may sometimes give rise to the pleasantest irony: the reader must smile at the speaker, while his heart warms to him. I shall close this essay with one example of such irony, an example which illustrates also the pitfalls into which even a learned Chaucerian may occasionally slip.

The pathetic death of Arcite is a matter of intense grief to his comrade-in-arms and his intended bride. 'Shrighte Emelye, and howleth Palamon' (2817); and Theseus carries away the prostrate heroine. At this point the Knight who tells the story embarks on a generalization, in the following terms:

What helpeth it to tarien forth the day  
To tellen how she weep bothe eve and morwe?  
For in swich cas wommen have swich sorwe,  
Whan that hir housbondes ben from hem ago,  
That for the moore part they sorwen so,  
Or ellis fallen in swich maladye,  
That at the laste certainly they dye. (2820-6)

'Coming from the author of the Wife of Bath,' remarks H. B. Hinckley in his *Notes on Chaucer*,<sup>1</sup> 'these words can only be construed as satire, or as insincerity. Was it such a passage as this—a passage which is certainly out of place—that prompted Matthew Arnold's celebrated saying that Chaucer lacked "high seriousness"?'

The Knight, however, is neither insincere, satirical, nor the author of the Wife of Bath; and it is probably a measure of our present distance from the Victorian critics that the irony of Chaucer, his constant perception of personal and spiritual incompatibilities in a complex humanity, is the very quality that gives him, in our eyes, his seriousness as a poet and a critic of life.

<sup>1</sup> Northampton, Mass., 1907, p. 113.

## ENGLISH ACTORS AT GHENT IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY<sup>1</sup>

By HARRY R. HOPPE

OWING largely to the diligence of German scholars we have considerable knowledge of English actors or acting companies playing in Germany in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and in lesser degree about their travels in other portions of northern Europe: Bohemia, Austria, northern France, Denmark, Sweden, and Holland.<sup>2</sup> But almost nothing has come to light about their visits to the Spanish Netherlands (substantially, what is now Belgium). Yet Englishmen travelling to the Continent would probably pass through this region more often than any other, since it was accessible by the shortest Channel crossing. Because it was a great commercial crossroads, one of the wealthiest regions of Europe, and a country whose inhabitants have long been known for their love of festivals and entertainments of all sorts, English players would have good reason to include it in their continental circuits.

<sup>1</sup> The basic material for this paper was gathered during the tenure in 1946-7 of an advanced fellowship awarded by the Belgian American Educational Foundation.

It is a pleasure to record my indebtedness to M. Henri Nowé, Archivist of the City of Ghent. Hoping to follow up the clues to English actors furnished by the Conseil Privé Espagnol documents of 1649 (quoted and discussed later in this article), I presented myself at the Ghent Archives. M. Nowé informed me that a search for the relevant documents at Ghent would be more complicated than I had anticipated and would occupy more time than the brief period remaining to me in Belgium would allow. He then very generously offered to make the search and transmit the results to me. As the reader will perceive, M. Nowé's investigations went far beyond a routine follow-up of the immediate clues. The documentary material from the Ghent archives in this article is largely his contribution; the responsibility for errors is mine.

<sup>2</sup> Most of the research on this subject was done in the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century. Very little new material has appeared since the publication of Chambers's *Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923). His bibliography in the chapter 'English Players on the Continent' (ii. 270-94) may be supplemented by C.B.E.L. i. 503. Reference may also be made to Frances A. Yates, 'English Actors in France during the Lifetime of Shakespeare', *R.E.S.* i (1925), 392-403; Ethel Seaton, *Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1935); Gustav Fredén, *Friedrich Menius und das Repertoire der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland* (Stockholm, 1939), which I have not been able to consult, and Gerald E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* (Oxford, 1941), vol. ii. The best account of George Jolly's continental wanderings is to be found in ch. iv, 'George Jolly and the Nursery', of J. L. Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), pp. 167 ff. Supplementary information about Jolly's provincial visits after the Restoration has been brought to light in Bernard M. Wagner, 'George Jolly at Norwich', *R.E.S.* vi (1930), 449-52 and Sybil Rosenfeld, *Strolling Players and Drama in the Provinces, 1660-1765* (Cambridge, 1939), pp. 35-8. A work which I shall cite frequently in the course of this article, Prosper Claeys, *Histoire du théâtre à Gand* (Ghent, 1892, 3 vols.), appears to have escaped the attention of historians of the English drama.

Records in the Municipal Archives of Ghent and the General Archives at Brussels reveal that English individuals and troupes offered entertainment to the inhabitants of Ghent at odd times throughout the first two-thirds of the seventeenth century. Not all are specified as actors. Rope-dancers, bear-wards, and fencers are also mentioned in the records. But as the distinction between acrobat and actor was then less sharp than nowadays, strolling players in foreign lands finding particular need to employ both kinds of skills,<sup>1</sup> we shall give all references to English entertainers, whether specified as actors or not.

How early travelling entertainers began to perform at Ghent is not known. Robert Browne, who played at Leyden in October 1590 on the first of his numerous continental wanderings,<sup>2</sup> may very possibly have included Ghent in his itinerary; but although all strolling entertainers were required to apply for and receive permission from the city authorities to perform, these *requêtes* were not preserved in the city records. An occasion for keeping records arose when, about 1598, a special chamber on the first floor of the Town Hall of Ghent was set aside and fitted out for dramatic performances. It became the custom thereafter for entertainers visiting the city for the first time to give a demonstration of their talents before the city councillors (*échevins de la Keure*),<sup>3</sup> their families, and invited friends in this hall, the *Comediantecaemer*, before offering their wares to the general public. For this initial performance the entertainers were reimbursed from the city treasury (Claeys, i. 46, 47; ii. 1-2, 4); hence it is the entrance of such payments in the account books that provides our record of the presence of foreign actors.

These 'command performances' served both as a form of censorship and as one of the perquisites of the councillors' office (Claeys, i. 52). At first, the approval of the councillors sufficed for the players. By 1651 the requirement had been extended to include the authorization of the *grand-bailli*. His consent seems to have ordinarily been granted without demur if the *échevins* had already indicated their approval (Claeys, ii. 20). By 1653 it had become customary for the magistrates to authorize performances in Ghent on the further condition that the entertainers contribute a certain

<sup>1</sup> E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), i. 345. When some of Shakespeare's future comrades travelled abroad in 1586 and 1587, the records placed as much emphasis upon their acrobatic as upon their acting ability (ibid. ii. 272-3).

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 273.

<sup>3</sup> There were two bodies of councillors or aldermen officiating at Ghent in this period, the *échevins de la Keure* and the *échevins des Parchons*, each numbering thirteen members. The *échevins des Parchons* had the relatively minor duties of probating estates and supervising the wardship of minors. The *échevins de la Keure* were the important governing body, not only controlling the regular municipal government but also administering civil and criminal justice (Claeys, i. 41). Subsequent references in this article to *échevins*, councillors, or aldermen will always imply the latter group.

sum to the *bureau de bienfaisance* for the relief of the poor. In 1666 it became a definite rule to require one benefit performance from each company for poor-relief (Claeys, i. 160). The entertainers appeared to have enjoyed the use of the *Comediantecaemer* without charge, provided they did no damage to the hall or its furnishings (Claeys, i. 165-6). If no other company was already established in the theatre, they continued to play there during the rest of their stay. If another company was using the *Comediantecaemer*, probably they hired a room in an inn or other public place.

This hall continued to exist as a municipal theatre—and in fact during most of the seventeenth century was the only permanent theatre in Ghent—until 1674, when it was converted into a store-room for arms. On 16 December 1715 the room was destroyed by fire (Claeys, ii. 72). Meanwhile in the last years of the seventeenth century two other theatres arose: from 1664 to 1698 the hall (*Gildenhuis*) of the Guild of St. Sebastian was available for performances; and some time after 1660 a theatre in the rue Magelein, *Het Gansken*, was erected and continued in use till about 1800 (Claeys, i. 57; ii. 28, 32). These were not under the direct control of the city authorities, and consequently performances there do not appear in the city records.

The stage of the *Comediantecaemer* was probably a very simple affair, little more than the curtain and a few draperies. These of course would be adequate for performances by rope-dancers or acrobats. When plays were presented, any special scenic material had to be provided by the actors (Claeys, ii. 17). In the traditional manner of strolling players, public performances were probably announced in the streets and squares to the accompaniment of trumpet and drum and by the parading of the actors through the town in their costumes. The same announcement would be repeated at the door of the theatre. Sometimes a manuscript or printed handbill would be posted on the door of the theatre with information about the play. At the end of each performance one of the important members of the company would come forth to thank the audience for its patronage and invite it to the next play, which he would describe (Claeys, ii. 13). How long a company continued to perform depended on its reception by the public. For the year 1660 Claeys gives us some information about the time two troops stayed: a company of French actors, the 'comédiens de Mademoiselle d'Orléans', performed at the town hall from 26 June to 7 August, a German troupe from 30 October to 26 November (Claeys, ii. 22-3). But as a rule the entries in the city records mark only the beginning of the actors' sojourn.

The first record of visiting entertainers appears in the city records for 1598-9,<sup>1</sup> when a troop of Italian artists (*Camerspelders*) performed before

<sup>1</sup> According to Claeys (ii. 5), from 1540 onwards the fiscal and administrative year, and the corresponding city accounts, began on 1 May. Before 1540 the year began on 15 August.



the councillors. The next recorded entertainer was one David Sittaert in 1601-2; and in the same year a group of unidentified actors presented plays and a dance called the *suumen*. On 3 October 1603 a French troupe gave the councillors a sample of its repertory (Claeys, i. 1-4). Thereafter French and Dutch companies, the most frequent and popular visitors, played at Ghent every year of the seventeenth century except 1678, when the city was bombarded and captured by the French under Louis XIV (Claeys, ii. 31). Next to French and Dutch entertainers, Italian and Spanish were the most frequent; English and German were among the least frequent.

The first record of English players occurs in the spring of 1604, when an unnamed group of English actors performed. About the same time a troupe of Italian actors had received £2 for a performance before the town councillors 'in the week of mid-Lent' and were further permitted to demand 4*d.* of every citizen coming to the comedy.<sup>1</sup> Immediately following the entry of the payment to the Italian company comes the record of the payment 'to certain English actors' of the same sum (£2) 'which was granted them in the same manner above on account of a certain other comedy also given by them in the aforesaid town hall under the aforementioned conditions'.

Betaelt an sekere Italiaensche commedianten de somme van 2 lb. gr. hemlieden by myne Heeren van den College ghejont uut hoveschede voor seker vertooch by hemlieden ghedaen int Schepenhuis van der Kuere van seker commedie ende ander spel in de Halfvasten weke, hebbende bovendien an de selve gheconsenteert moghen exigieren an elchen borghere commende de selve commedie hooren tot 4 groten sonder meer . . . . . 2 lb. gr.

Betaelt an seker Inghelsche commedianten ghelicke somme van 2 lb. gr. hemlieden van ghelicke ghejont allesins als boven ten respecte van seker andere commedie by hemlieden ooc vertoocht int voornoemde schepenhuis op de bovenscreven conditie . . . . . 2 lb. gr.

[Comptes de la Ville de Gand (*Archives de la Ville de Gand*, série 400). Année 1603-4, f. 272<sup>v</sup>]<sup>2</sup>

In 1604 mid-Lent (Thursday) fell on 18 March (N.S.), Lent itself running from 3 March to 18 April. The week of mid-Lent I presume to be the

<sup>1</sup> Concerning the Ghent money of this period Claeys observes: 'La livre de gros se subdivisait en 20 escalins et l'escalin en 12 gros. La livre équivalait à fr. 10.89 de notre monnaie; l'escalin à fr. 0.54, et le gros à fr. 0.04.' Since the relative proportions of livre, escalin, and gros are the same as pound, shilling, and penny, the latter terms will be employed throughout this article, even though the values were probably not the same.

<sup>2</sup> Hereafter in quoting from these accounts only the year and foliation will be cited. Dates of Lent in this article are based on the calendar in Sir Paul Harvey, *The Oxford Companion to English Literature* (rev. ed., Oxford, 1940).

week from Sunday the 14th to Saturday the 20th. We can only guess at the identity of this group. It may be the company that in September of the same year performed before the French court at Fontainebleau, or it may be the band led by Robert Browne which played at Frankfort in the autumn. (They may both be the same company, for Browne was in or near Paris in August and October 1604.) Another, much slighter, possibility is the company conjectured by Chambers to have been headed by John Spencer which carried a recommendation, dated 10 August 1604, from the Elector of Brandenburg and confirmed by Maurice of Orange-Nassau, Stadholder of the Netherlands, in the following December.<sup>1</sup> It should be added that the payment of £2 to each company suggests that they both had a fairly large personnel. Ordinarily the payment to acting companies in the early seventeenth century was about 16s. By 1650-60 the payment had increased to £10 (Claeys, ii. 18-19).

There may have been another English company at Ghent in this same year. 'En 1604 deux troupes de comédiens donnèrent des représentations à Gand: une troupe de comédiens français et une troupe de comédiens anglais. Cette troupe de comédiens anglais est, croyons-nous, celle qui dans le courant de cette même année donna des représentations dans les grandes villes de Hollande sous la direction d'un certain John Wood' (Claeys, ii. 4). Since Claeys does not cite a definite reference for this information it is impossible to determine whether it is based on the above entry (with 'comédiens français' an error for 'comédiens italiens') or on some other entry, perhaps later in the year. John Woods's company was playing at Leyden on 30 September of this year.<sup>2</sup> If Woods also played at Ghent, one would expect to find him there in the summer or autumn of 1604, just before or after playing in Holland, not in the spring, when the first, unidentified English players came.

The next English company to play before the aldermen was the troupe of pantomimists headed by William Peadle (or Pedel), who came in 1608 just after the departure of a Dutch troupe led by Jan van Castel (Claeys, ii. 5), probably in the late autumn or winter, for there is a record of Peadle's appearance at Leyden on 18 November. The Leyden visit has hitherto been the earliest-known fact in the career of an actor-acrobat who was active on the Continent and subsequently in the English provinces until perhaps as late as 1639.<sup>3</sup>

Three years later a company of English actors who had just finished

<sup>1</sup> Chambers, op. cit. ii. 280, 288, 293; Yates, 'English Actors in France', *R.E.S.* i (1925), 396, 402.

<sup>2</sup> Albert Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1865), pp. lxxvii-lxxviii.

<sup>3</sup> Chambers, op. cit. ii. 291; Edwin Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors* (New Haven, 1929), p. 270; Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* (Oxford, 1941), ii. 522.

playing at Louvain arrived in Ghent shortly after the commencement of Lent, which in 1611 began on 16 February, bearing with them the following letter from the Duke of Aremberg to the Ghent city councillors:

Messieurs

Après que ces présents comédiens Anglois ont joué en ce mien chasteau de Hévrelé de loing ces derniers caresmes douze à treize comedies, ilz m'ont a leur partement supplié et requis vous en faire ce mot ce que ie ne leur oy volu denyer, et par iceluy vous tesmoigner qu'à celles qu'ay esté present et suivant le rapport que ma esté faict des aultres où je ne suis esté présent, je n'y ay veu n'y recogneu quelque scandal n'y choses jllicites, pour y avoir occasion de le refuser la permission qu'ilz vont vous demander de pouvoir faire le mesme en vostre ville comme ils ont eu de mesme en celle de Louvain et ne servant à aultre fin.

je demeure Messieurs

Votre très-affectionné

Charles Gerart

de Hévrelé, le 18<sup>e</sup> Fébvrier 1611.

It would appear from the letter that this was not the first time the company had played at Louvain; it had performed at the Duke's château during several previous Lenten seasons ('de loing ces derniers caresmes'), perhaps making it a regular practice to come from England during the Lenten proscription of plays.<sup>1</sup> The city authorities did not require the customary initial performance in the *Comediantecaemer*, perhaps knowing them from previous visits or deeming the Duke's letter a sufficient attestation of the troupe's proficiency and good morals, but did allow them to play somewhere in the city, because on 25 February Charles Maes, Bishop of Ghent, sent a letter of protest to the *Échevins de la Keure*, requesting them to reject the actors' petition:

Edele, Eerwerdighe

Hebbende gelet op het verzoek van de comedianten en vinde gheensins geraden hun dat toelaten ghedurende desen heylighen tyedt van den vasten, midts daer uyt nyet te verwachten en is dan alle onstichtigheyt, verstroetheyt ende debauchement voor de gemeynthe, ende dat nyet teghenstaende het consent dat zy hebben van zyne hoocheyt wyens intentie presumere vastlyck nyet te wesen dat zy dat zouden gebruycken in alsulcken heylighen tyedt, sullen alsoe U. Eed. gelieven hun dat oock affteslaen, biddende hier met Godt almachtich U. Eed. te verleenen een goeden heylighen vasten,

Desen 25<sup>n</sup> February 1611.

U. Eed. zeer geaffectioneerde Dienaer  
Carolus Bisschop van Gendt.

<sup>1</sup> Chambers, op. cit. i. 315-16; Bentley, op. cit. ii. 654, n. 2. Through the kind mediation of Mr Jacques van der Belen, Secretary in Belgium for the Belgian American Educational Foundation, inquiries were made of the Archivist of the City of Louvain, who

Probably the councillors ignored the Bishop's protest and permitted the troupe to play; for, as Claeys observes, there is no marginal annotation on the letter to indicate, as was customary in such records, the disposition of the affair (Claeys, ii. 7-9). This is an early instance of a long-standing conflict in Ghent between the municipal authorities and the ecclesiastical authorities over the power to grant or withhold permission for entertainers to perform, particularly during Lent. The bishops of Ghent maintained that they had a sort of veto power on such applications. The councillors held that theirs was the sole power to grant or deny and that the bishop's concurrence with or rejection of the requests was merely advisory. Several years later, in 1649, as we shall see from documents to appear in due course, the bishop carried such a protest over the heads of the *échevins* to the Lieutenant-Governor of the Spanish Netherlands. On this occasion the bishop was sustained, but it seems to have marked a high point for the ecclesiastical forces. This was perhaps the only time that such a controversy went beyond the Council of Flanders, the provincial governing body, which was inclined to support the Ghent municipal authorities, and ultimately custom seems to have resolved the conflict in favour of the *échevins* (Claeys, i. 177-83). 'Les comédiens anglais', continues Claeys, 'revinrent à Gand au mois d'octobre de la même année [1611]', which suggests that the company was encouraged by the reception given its previous visit.

For the next few years the only English entertainers to be recorded are animal-wards and fencers. The accounts for 1612-13 record the payment of 16s. 8d. to Thomas Berghel 'born in England' for the display 'of his skill with pike and rapier':

Betaelt Mr Thomaes Berghel, gheboren van Inghelant, de somme van 16s. 8 gr. hem by myne Heeren Schepenen toegheleyt voor 't vertooch hemlieden ghedaen van syne conste metter spyse ende rapeire.

(1612-13, f. 292<sup>v</sup>)

On 12 June 1614 Jacques Lerecque, 'Englishman', received £2. 2s. for displaying the baiting of bears, bull, lion, and wolf by dogs:

Betaelt Jacques Lerecque, Inghelsman, de somme van 2 lb. 2s. gr. hem bygheleyt up den 12<sup>en</sup> Juny 1614, vertooch ghedaen hebbende an Schepenen van seker ghevecht van honden jeghens beeren, stier, leeu ende wulf.

(1614-15, f. 293<sup>v</sup>)

Two months later, in August 1614, Thomas Barret was paid 16s. for his display of 'skill in handling pikes and other kinds [of weapons]':

Betaelt Thomaes Barret, Ynghelsman, de somme van 16 s. gr. hem toegheleyt

reported that no trace of this company's visit can be found in the municipal records. Probably the band played only at the Duke's château and perhaps at other noble houses.

in de maendt van Aught, an myne Heeren Schepenen vertooch hebbende syne conste zoo van spelen metter spycen als anderssins.

(1614-15, f. 294<sup>v</sup>)

None of these entertainers is identifiable. In their present forms the names Berghel and Lerecque do not sound very English; probably they represent a phonetic transcription of English into something acceptable to Low Country ears and tongues, like the Jan Grin for John Green which we shall encounter shortly. They resemble nothing among the actors' names listed by Chambers, Nungezer, or Bentley.<sup>1</sup> The surname Barret has a more familiar ring. Though I find no notice of a Thomas Barret, a John Barret was head of a travelling company that played at Norwich in March 1635, and on 3 March 1640 was buried at St. Giles, Cripplegate; a Walter Barret is known as a travelling player associated with the Children of the Revels in documents of the years 1613, 1615, 1617, and 1623 or 1624.<sup>2</sup> Thomas Barret may have been related to these players.

In the Ghent accounts for 1616-17 we encounter for the first time two actors previously known as travelling on the Continent. Some time during that fiscal year £2 was paid to 'Robert Hartsius, Hendrick Griffin, Jan Waters and those of their company to the number of 18, English actors' for the exhibition 'of their sport and horse jumping':

Betaelt Robert Hartsius, Hendrick Griffin, Jan Waters ende haerlieder compaignye in ghetolle van achiene, Inghelsche commedianten de somme van 2 lb. gr., hemlieden by myne Heren Schepen toegheleyt vuer dexhibitie by de selve ghedaen an de voorseide Heeren van haerlieder spel ende voltigieren op 't peert.

(1616-17, f. 237)

John Waters I have not been able to trace,<sup>3</sup> but Robert 'Hartsius' and Henry Griffin are surely the Robert Archer (or Arzschar, Ertzer) and Heinrich Greum, English actors unearthed by German researchers. Greum is an easy graphic misreading of Greuin or Grevin; and taking into account the voiceless *v* of German orthography, we can see in Grevin a very likely phonetic spelling of Griffin. In the autumn of 1608 and 1610 Archer was associated with Griffin-Greum and Rudolph Beart in performances at the Frankfort Fair, and in September 1613 Archer received 20 florins for performing before the Emperor at Regensburg. In February or March 1614 he became a shareholder in a company under the patronage of the Elector of Brandenburg which also included William, Abraham, and Jacob Peadle. He served under the Elector until 16 May 1616, when

<sup>1</sup> My friend Professor R. C. Bald has suggested, very diffidently, that they may represent the English names Burkhill and Lerwick, a more plausible guess than anything that has come to my mind.

<sup>2</sup> Nungezer, *op. cit.*, p. 30; Bentley, *op. cit.* ii. 359.

<sup>3</sup> A Thomas Waters appears in a list of Children of Paul's in Oct. 1607 [H. N. Hillbrand, *The Child Actors* (Urbana, Ill., 1926), p. 112].



he was dismissed and paid 250 thalers in settlement of his claims.<sup>1</sup> His arrival at Ghent probably followed this date. The appearance of Griffin in conjunction with Archer suggests that the former was also a player in the Elector's company. It is possible that he was the same Griffin who appears (without Christian name) in the 'plot' of *Frederick and Basilea*, performed by the Admiral's company in June 1597.<sup>2</sup>

Between six and seven years passed before the next English troupe appears in the records, this one headed by one of the best known of all the English travelling actors of this period, John Green. They played a comedy before the aldermen on 19 April 1624 and a few days later received £2 for their performance:

Betaelt Jan Grin, Inghelschen commediant, de somme van 2 lb. gr., ter causen dat hy voor myne Heren Schepen gheagiert heeft eene commedie met syn compagnye volghende de ordonnantie van den xxi Aprilis 1624.

(1623-4, f. 235)<sup>3</sup>

All of Green's recorded career was on the Continent. He first appeared in association with Robert Browne at Strassburg in June 1606 and is recorded in the following years as visiting various German cities as well as Prague and Vienna. He was at Utrecht in November 1613, and in Cologne and Utrecht in April 1620, the year of the outbreak of the Thirty Years War. Thereafter he does not reappear in German annals till 1626.<sup>4</sup> Referring to the 1620 visit to Cologne and Utrecht, Chambers suggests very reasonably that Green 'was probably discreetly taking his company home'; however, his presence in Ghent as late as 1624 shows that his company most likely continued to gain a living in less-troubled areas of the Continent.

About a year later, on 10 May 1625, Thomas Rogers (Rogiers) and his company presented 'a certain representation and comedy' to the aldermen:

Betaelt Thomaes Rogiers, Inghelschen commediant, over hem ende syne compagnye de somme van 4 lb. groten ter causen van seker vertooch ende commedie by hemlieden an myne Heren Schepenen verthoont ende ghepresenteert den 10<sup>e</sup> Meye 1625

4 lb. gr.  
(1624-5, f. 210)<sup>5</sup>

This must have been an impressive company, as Claeys remarks, because it received double the fee granted to Green's troupe. It is therefore all the more surprising that no previous record of Thomas Rogers has come to

<sup>1</sup> Emil Herz, *Englische Schauspieler und englisches Schauspiel zur Zeit Shakespeares in Deutschland* (Hamburg, 1903), pp. 47, 53, 56; Nungezer, op. cit., pp. 21-2; Bentley, op. cit. ii. 350; Chambers, op. cit. ii. 291.

<sup>2</sup> Nungezer, op. cit., p. 166; *Henslowe Papers*, ed. W. W. Greg (London, 1907), p. 153.

<sup>3</sup> The date of performance and a transcript of the entry are given by Claeys (ii. 9), who, however, cites the page as f. 225.

<sup>4</sup> Nungezer, op. cit., pp. 159-61; Chambers, op. cit. ii. 280-7; Bentley, op. cit. ii. 451.

<sup>5</sup> The entry is also quoted by Claeys, ii. 10.

light. He may be related to two other Rogerses, an Edward and a William, who are recorded. The former, a boy player, appears in casts of Queen Henrietta's men for 1625 and 1626, but is not found thereafter; the latter is known only from the 1628 list of the Queen of Bohemia's company.<sup>1</sup>

Four or five years later one William Morley, certainly the bearer of an English-sounding name even though not so denominated, was paid 24s. for a 'certain action and recreation' presented to the aldermen:

Betaelt Willem Morley de somme van 24 s. gr. over seker jonste ende bylech hem ghedaen by myne Heeren Schepenen van der Keure ter causen van seker actie ende recreatie an de selve Heeren ghedaen volghende sijne quictantie houdende up den 13<sup>e</sup> Augustus 1629.

(1629-30, f. 207)

One can only surmise the nature of Morley's performance. The payment is materially less than that accorded to English playing-companies and to Lerecque, the bear-ward, but somewhat more than that received by the fencer Berghel. Perhaps he led a small group of acrobats and dancers. It may be noted that a Thomas Morley was a member of the Children of Paul's in 1574,<sup>2</sup> though the half-century interval strains the likelihood of any connexion.

For two decades after the visit of William Morley no records of English entertainers appear in the city accounts, though foreign players must have continued to come. The reason for this apparent hiatus is that in the accounts covering the years 1630-47 the entries merely specify payment to artistes (*camerspelders*) or actors (*commedianten*) without noting their nationality or the names of the leaders. Companies of Dutch and English actors played there in 1647 and 1649 (Claeys, ii. 12). The second visit, in Lent 1649, became the occasion of a dispute between *échevins* and Bishop that has already been alluded to. Both companies had apparently been regularly playing at Ghent during the annual fair held at mid-Lent and therefore did not have to give their qualifying performance at the *Comediantecaemer*. In this year Lent ran from 17 February to 4 April, mid-Lent Thursday falling on 4 March. Some time after the arrival of the acting companies, probably early in Lent, the ecclesiastical authorities protested to the Lieutenant-Governor of the Spanish Netherlands, Archduke Leopold of Austria. The protest has not been preserved in any documents seen by Claeys or the present writer. The Bishop of Ghent (Antoine Triest), however, mentions two letters written by him on this subject. The Dutch company may have yielded to this ecclesiastical pressure; for in February

<sup>1</sup> Bentley, *op. cit.* ii. 553; Nungezer, *op. cit.*, pp. 303-4. Some forty years later a Thomas Rogers was granted a licence to use a shovelboard [J. Q. Adams, *Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert* (New Haven, 1917), p. 131].

<sup>2</sup> Nungezer, *op. cit.*, p. 256; Hillebrand, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

a troop described as 'les maistres comédiens de la Compagnie Hollandoise', which came to Brussels but was prevented from playing because the Court was in mourning, requested the Archduke to grant them a passport for Germany. In June they had returned to Holland and were playing at The Hague.<sup>1</sup>

In consequence of the ecclesiastical protest, the Lieutenant-Governor issued on 28 February the following prohibition against dramatic performances in Ghent during the current Lent:

Leopold Guillaume par la grace de Dieu, archiducq d'Autriche ducq de Bourgogne et Lieutenant-Gouverneur et Capitaine général des Pays-Bas et de Bourgogne etc., etc.

Très chers et bien amez estant adverteez que la licence que a donné les années passées de représenter des comédies en la ville de Gand par des Anglois et des hollandois en ce temps de quaresme a esté désapprouvé de plusieurs personnes ecclésiastiques qui ont à leur charge le gouvernement spirituel de ladicte ville tant pour le scandale qu'en général cause un entretien si vain en ceste sainte quarantaine que pour ce qu'il divertist la jeunesse et grande partie de peuple des exercices et dévotions de l'Eglise oultre qu'au moyen de la paix accourent en ladicte ville beaucoup d'étrangers de contraire religion à qui serviroit de fort mauvais exemples qu'en un temps auxquels nous devons faire paroistre d'avantage nostre zèle en la religion l'on s'appliqueroit à telles vanitez, et ainsi pour ces raisons et plusieurs aultres nous avons trouvé convenir et nécessaire que l'on desfende semblables comédies en ce temps. Vous ordonnons partant au nom du Roy, Monseigneur, de donner incontinent à ce les ordres nécessaires. A tant très-chers et bienamez Nostre Seigneur vous ait en sa sainte garde.

de Bruxelles le 28<sup>e</sup> de février 1649.

Paraphé Ro V. Soubsigné Leopold Guillaume et Veryken. La superscription estoit à nos très-chers et bien amez les conseillers et gens du conseil provincial du Roy en Flandres.

La cour ordonne aux Echevins de la keure de ceste ville de se regler selon les ordres susdicts de 28<sup>e</sup> du mois passé contenant défense d'admettre comédiens pendant le quaresme et au mesme effect ordonne au premier huissier de ce conseil de livrer copie à iceulx de ceste et desdictes lettres, fait le iiij de mars 1649.

Soubsigné MASSEAU.

(Claeys, i. 180-1; from Archives du Conseil de Flandre, *Resolutien van den Hove*, 1625-63, f. 262<sup>v</sup>)

This edict, as we see, was received on 4 March by the Council of Flanders, who transmitted a copy to the city council on the 6th. The city authorities promptly appealed to the Governor-General:

Au Roi.

Remonstrent très-humblement les Echevins de Gand que ceux du conseil de

<sup>1</sup> Henri Liebrecht, *Histoire du théâtre français à Bruxelles au XVII<sup>e</sup> et au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1923), pp. 49, 51.

Flandre leur ont fait insinuer le 6 de ce mois copie d'une lettre que son altesse auroit esté servi leur fair escrire le 28 fébvrier passé contenant défense d'admettre en cest ville des comédiens pendant ce quaresme soubz prétexte comme il est dict par ladicte lettre que les dicts comédiens seroient désapprouvés de plusieurs ecclésiastiques tant pour le scandal qu'en général causeroit un entretien samblable que pour ce qu'il divertist la jeuneesse et partie du peuple des exercices et dévotions de l'église selon qu'est dict plus amplement par ladicte copie cy jointe. Et comme cette lettre est obtenue ob et subrepticement et sans entendre les remonstrants en leur defense et que telles récréations y ont esté tolerées de tout temps, tant pour les habitans qu'estrangers quy y arrivent a cause de la foire qu'il y at tous les ans à demij quaresme n'en aijant point d'autres au long de l'année et que presentement il y at des comédiens en icelle ville auxquels les remonstrants ont dès ja donné permission pour représenter leurs comédies avant que ladicte lettre aijt esté insinuée lesquels ensuite ont faict les préparations ordinaires à leurs grands frais et despens qu'en oultre leurs comédies ne contiennent aucun scandal et sont préallablement visitées et finalement que les remonstrants ont esté portez à les admettre à fin d'en faire profiter quelque somme d'argent a la chambre des puvres comme il s'est pratiqué en ceste ville, pour la secourir en la necessité dans laquelle ladicte chambre se trouve presentement, ils se retirent a vostre Majesté.

La suppliant humblement que son plaisir soit de permettre que les dicts comédies y puissent estre représentées comme de tout temps prennant favorable esgard aux raisons cy dessus alléguées et que celles portées par ladicte lettre remonstrées infalliblement par quelques ecclésiastiques ne sont qu'imaginaires pour ne causer icelles comedies aucun scandal nij divertissement de devotion ains plutot une édification et instruction à une parfaite cognoissance des histoires qui s'ij représentent.

Quoij faisant, etc.

(Claeys, i. 181-2)

On 11 March the Privy Council, desiring the advice of the Council of Flanders, forwarded to the latter the appeal of the Ghent city authorities, a copy of the edict of 28 February, and a letter of transmittal charging them to reply within twenty-four hours of receiving the communication. These were received by the Council of Flanders on 16 March, who on the same day replied as follows:

Treshonnorez et doubtiez Seigneurs aux bonnes graces de Vos Seigneuries prions estre recommandez

Messieurs,

Nous avons ce jourdhuy, receu lettres du Roy, nostre Sire de l xje de ce mois, avecq la Requête presentee a Sa Majesté de la part des Eschevins et Conseil de Gand, tendant afin que le plaisir de sadicte Majesté soit, de permettre, que les Comedies mentionnées par ladicte Requête, pourroient estre representees comme de tout temps, pour les raisons reprises par ladicte Requête, laquelle Icelle nous at ordonné de veoir, et visiter, et sur ce mesme subiect, la reserver, ou bien voz Seigneuries d'office de nostre aduis, au lendemain de la reception,

Pour a quoi satisfaire

Messieurs

nous avons veu, et visité ladicte Requeste, et le contenu en icelle, mis en deliberation, disons que, a la reception des lettres de Son Alteze Serenissime du xxvii<sup>e</sup> de febvrier dernier, portans defence de n'admettre en ladicte Ville de Gand aucuns Comediens, pendant le Quaresme, dont Copie est jointe a ladicte Requeste, l'avons fait insinuer ausdicts Suppliants, et comme trouvons les raisons de defence portées par lesdictes lettres du tout fondées, mesmes que les Suppliants sollicitent l'admission disdicts Comediens, contre l'interdiction expresse de Son Alteze, reprise par sesdictes lettres, fondées en consideration du Quaresme, destiné a l'exercice de toutes oeuvres et exercices de devotion et pieté, la ou les representations, qui se font par telles Comedies, ne tendent ordinairement qu'a des vanitez, scandales et lubricitez, serions a tant d'adviz (: a treshumble correction :) que les Suppliants se devoient conduire, selon le commandement de sadicte Alteze, Duquel advis est aussy le Reverendissime Evesque de Gand, auquel aiant communiqué la rqueste desdicts Suppliants, nous a fait exhiber l'escript cy jointe, Nous en rapportans neantmoins au bon plaisir de Sa Majesté et a la trespourveue discretion de Voz Seigneuries ausquelles renvoyans ladicte Requeste prions Dieu,

Messieurs De les maintenir  
en ses Saintes et divines graces a longues et  
heureuses annees De Gand le xv<sup>j</sup> de Mars 1649  
Voz Serviteurs les Gens  
du Conseil de Sa Majesté  
Ordonné en flandres

A. d'Hanesse

(Archives Générales du Royaume de Belgique, *Conseil Privé Espagnol*, carton 1280, folder entitled 'Comédiens')<sup>1</sup>

On 20 March, having received the letter from the Council of Flanders, a secretary of the Privy Council wrote in the upper left corner of the same document the characteristic *apostille* for the denial of a request: 'Vue la rescription de Ceulx du Conseil en flandres ce que se requiert ne se peut accorder', and doubtless a letter to this effect was sent to the Council of Flanders and in turn transmitted to the city councillors. Whether they bowed to this order is questionable. They had evidently continued to allow stage performances while the protest and appeal were under consideration. By the time the official notification reached them, Holy Week was not far off, when probably the actors would not be permitted to play anyway. We may surmise that the comedians played out the time originally allowed them.

The Bishop's 'escript cy jointe', referred to in the letter by the Council of Flanders, is also preserved and merits reproduction as an ecclesiastical brief against stage performances:

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Paul Hospel of the General Archives, Brussels, has kindly verified my transcripts of these documents. Expanded contractions are indicated by italics.

Raisons pour lesquelles le Reverendissime Evesque de cette Ville de Gand ne trouve pas convenables de permettre l'exhibition des comedies.

- 1<sup>o</sup> Pour ce que les commediens sont gens suspects, se comme composez d'hollandois, Anglois et autres nations estrangeres,
- 2<sup>o</sup> Que lesdites commediens ne representent que histoires profanes, dont la jeunesse ne tire que matieres d'amourettes pleines de discours et actions pour la desbaucher,
- 3<sup>o</sup> Que lesdites comedies ne se representent qu'en plein soir, lors qu'on est accoustume de chanter le Salve ou faire les meditations, dont la jeunesse est divertie,
- 4<sup>o</sup> Que ce saint temps de Quaresme requiert de soy mesme qu'on s'addonne a plus de devotions qu'en un autre temps,
- 5<sup>o</sup> Qu'en hollande mesme on ne permet pas de représenter semblables pieces les jours de dimanches, ou de leurs prieres,
- 6<sup>o</sup> Que les comediens admis tirent une bonne partie d'argent, qui pourroit estre mieux employé ailleurs,
- 7<sup>o</sup> Que les comedies finies sur le soir, la jeunesse se retire ordinairement dans des cabarets et maisons suspectes au desceu des parens,

Finalement Que lesdites comedies ne devoient estre admises ne fust apres la lecture et visitation de ce qu'elles contiennent,

Au surplus Son Alteze Serenissime mesme ne trouve pas expedient d'admettre lesdicts comediens en cette Ville de Gand au Quaresme come il conste par deux diverses lettres escriptes sur ce subiect.

We may pause here to speculate on the identity of the English acting company caught in the middle of this tug of war between ecclesiastical and municipal authorities. Possibly it is a troupe containing Jeremias Kite, William Cooke, Thomas Loveday, and Edward Shatterell which is recorded as established at The Hague from November 1644 to February 1644/5.<sup>1</sup> The two last-named actors became members of Killigrew's King's Company after the Restoration. Somewhat more probably it was the group led by George Jolly, whose continental career in the Interregnum and English career after the Restoration are set forth by J. L. Hotson in his *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*. Apart from a record of the baptism and burial in London of a son in July 1640,<sup>2</sup> nothing definite has come to light about Jolly before he emerges about 1648 as leader of a troupe of English actors on the Continent. On 6 March 1648 (n.s.) 'a pack of Players from France' was reported as arriving at The Hague; these Hotson supposes to have been Jolly's company. At the end of April Jolly at the head of a band of fourteen actors reached Cologne, having come by way of the Netherlands with a stop at Bruges.<sup>3</sup> If both references are to the same company, Ghent

<sup>1</sup> Bentley, op. cit. ii. 413, 493-4, 498, 523, 571.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 484.

<sup>3</sup> Hotson, op. cit., pp. 36, 168.



could have been included in the France–The Hague or the Netherlands–Bruges–Cologne journey. After playing at Cologne till the end of July, his company moved on to Frankfort for the autumn fair. They returned to Cologne early in 1649, some time after the execution of Charles I (9 February N.S.), and in requesting permission to play again in Cologne Jolly informed the city authorities ‘that his troupe had played in England, the Low Countries, and Germany; that (and here he stretched the truth) he could not go back to England because a bloody war had broken out there’.<sup>1</sup> The known dates and the reference to a Low Countries visit make it a reasonable surmise that Jolly’s was the English company at Ghent. The unscrupulousness and quarrelsomeness which are revealed by Jolly’s career may also have played a part in the objections of the ecclesiastical authorities to the presence of his company.

The penultimate visit of English entertainers to be recorded in the city accounts is that of an unnamed troupe of rope-dancers in Lent of 1651 who were paid 24s. for their first performance by warrant dated 22 March:

Betaelt aen de Inghelsche coordedansers de somme van 24 s. gr. om ’t eerste vertooch by hemlieden aen de Heeren van ’t Collegie ghedaen ende verthoont, by ordonnancie van 22 Maerte 1651 . . . . . 2 lb.  
(1650–1, f. 162)

Exhibitions by rope-dancers, Claeys tells us, were one of the spectacles most favoured by the citizenry of Ghent. The fees paid by the city council for the first performance ranged from 10s. to £6, depending upon the talent and agility of the performers (Claeys, i. 49). This English company must have been regarded as no better than mediocre.

The final reference to English visitors is perhaps the most tantalizing of all. About 1 February 1663 (the date of the warrant) ‘the Comedians of the King of England’ were paid £4 for their introductory performance in the *Comediantecaemer*:

Betaelt de Commedianten van den Coninck van Inghelandt de somme van vier ponden over ’t vertooch by hemlieden ghedaen aen myne Heren Schepen volghende der requeste ende ordonnantie van 1 Februari 1663 . . . 4 lb. gr.  
(1662–3, f. 2)

The disbursement of only £4 at a time when £10 was the prevailing fee for a regular, full company (Claeys, i. 50; ii. 18–19) suggests that this was a small, unimpressive band. If this troupe was the one known to London as the King’s Company, the evidence is conflicting. Killigrew, the manager, opened the company’s new Theatre Royal, Bridges Street, on 7 May 1663. It is quite possible that the company was ‘at liberty’ for a time while properties, costumes, and other gear were being transferred from the old

Vere Street theatre, and took that occasion to travel abroad. There is nothing in standard histories of the Restoration stage (like Nicoll, Hotson, or Summers) to support or deny this possibility. On the other hand, Eleanore Boswell's list of court performances shows performances by the King's men on 4 January, 5 February, and 23 February 1662/3,<sup>1</sup> dates which span the very time when the Comedians of the King of England were in Ghent and therefore, unless a fraction of the company withdrew from London to travel on the Continent, appear to eliminate the chance of the two companies being the same.

At first view George Jolly's troupe also seems a likely identification. From September 1655 till the end of his Interregnum travels on the Continent Jolly had assumed the title of the King's servants, evidently on the strength of performing before Charles II and some of his court while the royal exiles were on a pleasure-visit to Frankfort. With the Restoration Jolly returned to London and in November 1660 petitioned for a royal licence to act, which was granted on 24 December 1660. Thereupon Jolly gathered together a band of actors and proceeded to give the companies managed by Davenant and Killigrew more competition than they hankered for, so that the two managers were forced to buy Jolly off, in effect, by paying him £4 a week not to play in London. Jolly then obtained a warrant from Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, and a letter from the King to play in the country.<sup>2</sup>

During Jolly's absence from London Davenant and Killigrew connived to cheat him permanently of his London licence.<sup>3</sup> In July, while Jolly was playing in Norwich (from 15 April till at least 19 August) they succeeded in obtaining a revocation of his licence,<sup>4</sup> though the revocation seems to have been without effect, as another had to be issued in 1667.<sup>5</sup> Yet Jolly does not appear to have returned to London to oppose their machinations till some time in 1664.<sup>6</sup> The accepted explanation of his slowness in defending himself is that he was playing in the provinces. An even more clinching explanation would be his absence abroad, where he well might have been before and perhaps even after his Norwich sojourn. The difficulty lies in the dates of the documents issued him by the Master of the Revels and the King. The former, though bearing the date 1 January, was not delivered till the 27th; the latter is dated 29 January.<sup>7</sup> The 27th and

<sup>1</sup> Eleanore Boswell, *The Restoration Court Stage* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), App. C, p. 281.

<sup>2</sup> Hotson, op. cit., pp. 172, 177-82.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., pp. 182-6.

<sup>4</sup> Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama, 1660-1700* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 277; Wagner, 'George Jolly at Norwich', *R.E.S.* vi (1930), 450.

<sup>5</sup> Nicoll, op. cit., p. 278; Hotson, op. cit., pp. 406-7.

<sup>6</sup> Hotson, op. cit., p. 186; Montague Summers, *The Playhouse of Pepys* (London, 1935), p. 117.

<sup>7</sup> Nicoll, op. cit., p. 277; Hotson, op. cit., pp. 405-6.

29th correspond to 6 and 8 February N.S., but, as we have seen, payment at Ghent to the Comedians of the King of England was authorized on 1 February. This conflict of dates seems to eliminate Jolly, unless we find that someone in London acted as his agent in receiving the documents from the Master of the Revels and the King.

In 1665 the same company gave several performances at Ghent (Claeys, ii. 10). Their visit probably followed the closing of the London theatres in June 1665 on account of the plague.<sup>1</sup> During the remainder of the century the Ghent city accounts have no record of English entertainers.<sup>2</sup>

In consequence of the information presented on the foregoing pages gaps are reduced in our knowledge of the careers of several known English actors on the Continent (William Peadle, Robert Archer, Henry Griffin-Greum, and John Green), some new names can be added to the roster (John Waters, Thomas Rogers, and perhaps William Morley—not to forget Thomas Berghel, Jacques Lerecque, and Thomas Barret), and our realm of speculation about other companies is enlarged.

After this article had been set up, I received information which calls for correction of a few passages. Feeling some disquiet about many of Claeys's assertions, I had requested a re-examination of the Ghent city accounts at the relevant places. Mr. J. Boes, associate archivist, kindly undertook the task, and his results show that we must view some of Claeys's statements with reserve: (1) Nothing in the accounts suggests the visit of a second English company in 1604 (cf. p. 309). Having read in Cohn's *Shakespeare in Germany* of John Woods's performances at Leyden in that year, Claeys apparently assumed that the company also visited Ghent. (2) The accounts for 1608 record no performance by William Peadle's or any other English troop (cf. p. 309). Once again, Claeys seems to have thought that because Peadle performed at Leyden (Cohn, p. lxxxiii) he also came to Ghent. (3) The accounts record payments to a Dutch company in 1647 and 1649, but to no English company (cf. p. 314). Claeys gives no source for his statement concerning the 1647 visit of English players. (4) There is no record in the accounts for 1665 that the Comedians of the King of England played at Ghent; and Claeys was manifestly in error in recording a 1664 performance by this troop (cf. n. 1 below). The 1663-4 register, Mr. Boes points out, does not even contain 240 pages, therefore the supposed extract from f. 240<sup>v</sup> is impossible.

<sup>1</sup> Summers, op. cit., pp. 117, 142 n. Quoting from the city accounts for 1663-4, f. 240<sup>v</sup>, Claeys (i. 47) refers to another visit of the Comedians of the King of England; but since his extract, so far as it goes, agrees word for word with the entry for the 1 Feb. 1663 payment, I am inclined to think that he is in error here.

<sup>2</sup> Claeys, ii. 10, and confirmed by M. Nowé in a private communication.

## THE NAMING OF CHARACTERS IN DEFOE, RICHARDSON, AND FIELDING

By I. P. WATT

His [Walter Shandy's] opinion, in this matter, was, That there was a strange kind of magick bias, which good or bad names, as he called them, irresistibly impressed upon our characters and conduct.

*Tristram Shandy*, i. 19.

### I

THE novelist—following the convention of comedy noted by Aristotle<sup>1</sup>—usually invents the names, as well as the actions, of his characters. In most fiction until the eighteenth century the names used were quite different from those used in real life; they were 'characteristic', artificial and conventional designations suited to the half-generalized types that figure in romance and pastoral. It was only in the later developments of fiction—the professedly non-fictional 'true histories', biographies, and memoirs—that the names used could possibly be mistaken for those of real people.

Defoe, of course, is in the latter tradition. The names of his heroes and heroines all sound real; even the apparent exception, Roxana, is explained as an alias.<sup>2</sup> But though realistic, they are rarely the true, full, permanent names, ratified by baptism and legal record, to which we are accustomed. Thus Captain Bob Singleton has no baptismal name; Colonel Jacque, having no surname, goes by his nickname, and a mock rank; and Moll Flanders is known to us by a canting pseudonym. Robinson Crusoe is the only one of Defoe's main characters who is given a full name and maintains it.

Defoe is especially casual about naming his secondary characters. He rarely gives them complete names, and usually refers to them by some *ad hoc* description of their status or role—'the Quaker', 'the honest Dutch merchant', &c. This practice sets a special tone to his treatment of human relationships in the novels. In *Moll Flanders*, for example, the seducer is described only as 'the elder brother'; the first husband, the younger brother, is only given a christian name, and that long after his first introduction, in the course of casual conversation; and Moll Flanders herself is known at this time only by the name of 'Betty', the generic name for

<sup>1</sup> 'In comedy . . . the poet first constructs the plot on the lines of probability, and then inserts characteristic names. . . . But tragedians still keep to real [i.e. historical] names' (*Poetics*, trans. Butcher, 9).

<sup>2</sup> *The Fortunate Mistress*, ed. G. A. Aitkin (London, 1902), i. 200.

maidservants.<sup>1</sup> It is clear that neither Moll Flanders, nor her creator, feels any need to go much beyond the banal outlines of a newspaper story—'Orphan Servant Girl Seduced by Young Heir and Cast Off on Younger Brother'. They do not believe that the details of personal relationships are inherently interesting or important; they are much too self-centred and pragmatic to wish to explore those aspects of the personalities of the individuals on their path which do not affect them personally.

This attitude towards people is the rule in Defoe. Apart from the 'I' of his autobiographical narratives, all Defoe's characters are treated as strictly secondary; and, almost without exception, they lack the most elementary requirement of completeness, a full name. Even Crusoe's Man Friday and Roxana's Amy, vivid as they are, do not transcend their role as loyal servants of the protagonists; and, just as they have no independent life, so they are limited in their presentation to the implied patronage of being designated by a christian name only. The truth of this generalization about Defoe's attitude to the names and personalities of his secondary characters is confirmed by the main apparent exception; in *Captain Singleton* William Walters does get a complete name, but he also tends to overshadow the titular hero.

Defoe's practice in the naming of his characters cannot, of course, be attributed entirely to his severely functional view of personal relationships, although this is perhaps the key to his isolated position among novelists. His economy in the use of names is also appropriate to the genre which he practised, and to the society which he described. Feigned reticence about the names of characters was traditional in Defoe's formal models—secret histories, memoirs, and criminal biographies; and anonymity is a condition of life for those who, like Moll Flanders and Roxana, inhabit the underworld. There, real names are rarely known, and even more rarely committed to writing. The business of life can be carried on much more conveniently by aliases, or any casual means of identification. Such conditions of human intercourse necessarily affect the characters of those concerned; deprived of a complete and consistent name the denizens of this world are also prevented from having the consistent social personality which such a name symbolizes. Thus Roxana's pseudonyms are convenient tags for her role in different social contexts; her true being is characterized, not by her name, but by the fact that she has many names, which must be kept secret from all those with whom she might otherwise be able to achieve a stable personal relationship. Eventually the need to maintain her incognito forces her to hide in terror from her own daughter.

<sup>1</sup> I have to thank Professor John Butt for advice on this and many other points: and I should like to take this opportunity of acknowledging the generous assistance of Miss G. Lloyd Thomas, Mr. M. J. C. Hodgart, Dr. R. W. Chapman, and Professors A. D. McKillop, W. M. Sale, G. Tillotson, J. A. Work, and L. B. Wright.

Defoe's reticence about names has a further, and even more general, relation to the usage of his day. For members of the lower classes a full name was not yet an essential attribute; they rarely used surnames and sometimes did not even have one. This is shown by the seventeenth-century practice of arranging lists of names alphabetically by christian name;<sup>1</sup> and by the frequency of the entry '*. . . ignoti cognominis*' in parish registers.<sup>2</sup> To-day, surnames are essential to the legal man, the citizen filler-of-forms, but even as late as the early eighteenth century the official legal and political machinery tended to ignore all those who were without a minimum of property and status. Consequently, rural vagrants and the growing urban proletariat—all those beneath the requirements of wills, apprenticeship-deeds, and marriage-licences—did not need anything more than a name by repute. Even for marriage-licences—and their use was by no means universal—parties were not officially required to deliver their true christian and surnames until the Marriage Act of 1753.<sup>3</sup>

Personal names derive their sanction from the ceremonies of religion and law, ceremonies from which Defoe's characters, like the classes to which they belonged, are habitual abstainers. The Church forbade people to use any name other than that sanctified at baptism;<sup>4</sup> but Defoe's main characters are often forced to do so, either for concealment,<sup>5</sup> or because they do not know their baptismal names.<sup>6</sup> Marriage, the next legal and religious ceremony affecting names, is also minimized in Defoe's novels. We are not told any of the new surnames that Moll Flanders presumably acquired in the course of her five marriages, although a proper attention to such niceties would have spared her from the incestuous marriage to her half-brother.

For many reasons, then, Defoe's characters do not have, or cannot use, the labels which in our society symbolize the individual's stable social role. Deprived of social recognition and condemned to an anonymous existence in which no permanent human attachments are possible, they are unfitted for, or perhaps even unaware of, the kind of social relationship which has become the traditional subject-matter of the novel.

But as the century advanced modern practice in the matter of names gradually established itself. Legal records show an increasing rigidity of documentation, influenced in part by the Marriage Act of 1753. At the

<sup>1</sup> C. L. L'Estrange Ewen, *History of Surnames of the British Isles* (London, 1931), p. 388.

<sup>2</sup> See Preface, *Registers and Publications of the Harleian Society* (London, 1877), i. ix.

<sup>3</sup> Ewen, *op. cit.*, pp. 219, 388, 401.

<sup>4</sup> E. G. Withycombe, *Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names* (Oxford, 1945), p. xxiv.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. Roxana, Moll Flanders.

<sup>6</sup> Colonel Jacque, ed. G. A. Aitkin (London, 1902), i. 2; *Captain Singleton* ('Everyman Edition', London, 1906), p. 2.



same time modes of address—'Mr.', 'Mrs.', 'Master', and 'Miss'—were beginning to assume their modern meanings,<sup>1</sup> and the use of kinship appellations, which stress the group status, rather than the personal uniqueness, of the individual, was becoming unfashionable.<sup>2</sup> These are minor aspects of a larger social process—the rise of modern individualism—of which the development of the novel-form is the chief literary expression; the novelists of the mid-century were likely to be more attentive than Defoe in the naming, and at the same time to the portrayal, of their characters.

## II

In christening their beloved daughter, John and Elizabeth Andrews disregarded the tradition of piety which was embodied in their own christian names and that of their author. The name 'Pamela' was contained neither in the Bible nor in the Calendar of Saints.

It was also extremely rare in real life. The Richardsonian pronunciation—evidenced in the verses Pamela makes<sup>3</sup>—moved the accepted stress from *Paméla* to *Pámela*. Richardson<sup>4</sup> and Fielding<sup>5</sup> both comment on the rarity of the name, and the change of accent occupied Aaron Hill, Mrs. Barbauld,<sup>6</sup> and, at much greater length, the pages of *Notes and Queries*.<sup>7</sup>

It has been generally assumed that the name comes from Sidney's *Arcadia*,<sup>8</sup> and a passage from the second part of *Pamela* shows that Richardson assumed both the heroine's and the reader's knowledge of Musidorus as the name of Pamela's lover.<sup>9</sup> We can certainly assume that Richardson

<sup>1</sup> See O.E.D. and Myra Reynolds, *The Learned Lady in England* (Boston, 1920), p. 76, fn.

<sup>2</sup> See William Shenstone, 'Essays on Men, Manners, and Things', *Works* (London, 1764), ii. 156.

<sup>3</sup> 'Pamela—did you say?—A queer sort of Name! I've heard of it somewhere! Is it a Christian or a Pagan Name?' [*Pamela* (1st ed., Part II, London, 1741), iii. 316].

<sup>4</sup> '... a very strange name, *Paméla* or *Pámela*: some pronounced it one way and some the other' (*Joseph Andrews*, Bk. IV, ch. 12).

<sup>5</sup> *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson* (London, 1804), i. lxxviii.

<sup>6</sup> 2nd Ser. ix. 305, 394; 5th Ser. x. 88, 234; 9th Ser. xii. 141, 330. . . .

<sup>7</sup> e.g. by Charlotte Yonge, *History of Christian Names* (London, 1863), ii. 485; Paul Dottin, *Samuel Richardson* (Paris, 1931), pp. 59, 72; E. Poetzsche, *Samuel Richardsons Belesenheit* (Kiel, 1904), p. 41.

<sup>8</sup> Pamela relates that at a masquerade 'a Presbyterian Parson came up, and bid me look after my Musidorus—so I doubted not by this, it must be one who knew my name to be Pamela' (Pt. II, Letter LVI). The *Arcadia* was certainly well known in the period—it was reprinted twice in 1725 and again in 1739. It was admired by several of Richardson's friends, including Sarah Fielding, Mrs. Delany, and Aaron Hill. [See S. Fielding, *Lives of Cleopatra and Octavia*, cit. A. D. McKillop, 'The Personal Relations between Richardson and Fielding', *M.P.* xxviii (1931), 433; *Autobiography and Correspondence of Mrs Delany*, ed. S. C. Woolsey (Boston, 1882), p. 258; D. Brewster, *Aaron Hill* (New York, 1915), p. 190.] Further strong evidence is contained in W. M. Sale's forthcoming study of Richardson's printing-house, where, mainly by comparing types and ornaments, it is established that Richardson printed at least a part of the *Arcadia* as his share of the 1724/5 edition of Sidney's works.

knew that his heroine's name suggested 'vaine amatorious romance', rather than the pedestrian piety of the Andrews household. The only strictly realistic interpretation of Pamela's name, therefore, is social pretentiousness on the part of the parents—as Fielding<sup>1</sup> was quick to point out by giving Shamela's mother a triple string of fashionable names—Henrietta Maria Honora—which give the lie to her professions of humility.

The more important explanation of this departure from realism is that Richardson, despite his frequent assertions of superiority, continues the tradition of romance, especially in his treatment of women, whose literary interests and personal ideals were still, as he knew, influenced by the patterns of romantic love, even in the matter of names.<sup>2</sup>

Stereotyped christian names from the pastoral and heroic romances had been very generally adopted, especially as a courtship-convention, by the polite society of the seventeenth century. Their use was gradually extended from amorous intrigues and gallant verses to the most blameless conversational and epistolary intercourse, even amongst the most rigidly moral and puritan groups.<sup>3</sup> The convention appealed primarily to women, partly because it suggested the social patterns associated with courtly love, in which the lady played a flatteringly dominant role. Such were the roles of the heroines in romances, and it was natural that many women readers should project their own aspirations—too often thwarted by their actual subordinate position in society—upon the names of these heroines.

Whatever the explanation, it is certain that the novel-reading girls satirized in eighteenth-century comedy yearn to be re-christened by the name of a romance heroine. One of the earliest, Biddy Tipkins, in *The Tender Husband* (1705), is most eloquent on the subject:

How often Madam, must I desire you to lay aside that familiar name, Cousin Biddy? I never hear it without blushing—did you ever meet with a heroine in those idle romances as you call 'em, that was termed Biddy? . . . No, the heroine has always something soft and engaging in her name, something that gives us a notion of the sweetness of her beauty and behaviour, a name that glides through half a dozen tender syllables, as Elisamonda, Clidamira, Deidamira, that runs upon vowels off the tongue. . . . 'Tis strange rudeness those familiar names they give us. . . .<sup>4</sup>

Novel heroines themselves usually bore such names, and one of them,

<sup>1</sup> The attribution of *Shamela* to Fielding is discussed, and further strengthened, by C. B. Woods in his article 'Fielding and the Authorship of *Shamela*', *P.Q.* xxxv (1946), 248-72.

<sup>2</sup> Dottiin writes that in *Pamela* and *Clarissa*, Richardson used names 'suffisamment romanesques pour impressionner le genre de lecteur qu'il s'agissait d'atteindre' (op. cit., p. 72).

<sup>3</sup> See the correspondence of Mrs. Rowe, Mrs. Delany, and Philip Doddridge.

<sup>4</sup> Act II, Sc. i.

Penelope Aubin's Lucinda, is also most articulate about her good fortune; she confesses that

I was wonderfully pleased that my Mother had happened to give me the Name of *Lucinda*: it sounded in my thoughts Poetick and Romantick . . . by it I lost the Favour of an Aunt, who it is supposed would have left me all she was worth had my Mother consented to have me named *Dorothy* after my Aunt's Name. Alas! I was so foolish that I lamented not for this, and I would not for twice the Fortune have been called by so vulgar a Name.<sup>1</sup>

The primary diagnostic of such names is the ending in '-a' or '-ia'; Charlotte Yonge notes that in the eighteenth century 'no heroine would be deemed worthy of figuring in a narrative without this flourish at the end of her name'.<sup>2</sup> Both Richardson and Fielding follow this convention; but their selection of names within the category reveals important and characteristic differences of attitude. Fielding's last two heroines, Sophia and Amelia, bear by far the commonest names within the category, for both names had been popularized by the Brunswick dynasty.<sup>3</sup> This suggests that their creator's acquiescence in the romance tradition was formal and unenthusiastic. The names that Richardson chose for his first two heroines, on the other hand, although not too outrageous to be accepted as real, were rare and distinctively romantic.

Richardson was certainly aware of the importance of book titles,<sup>4</sup> and also of the value girls like Biddy Tipkins attached to the possession of a romantic name. But as a moralist he could not endorse such attitudes. Indeed he goes out of his way to criticize *The Tender Husband*, which Pamela sees in London. Despite her admiration for Steele, she is 'forced to disapprove of every character in it, and the views of everyone'.<sup>5</sup> We may surmise an especial objection to the scene where the gallant and experienced Clerimont advances the name 'Pamela' as a bait to trap Biddy Tipkins. He knows her aversion to her own name, and his flattering pretence that her real name is 'Pamela' wins her rapturous aside—'I could hear him ever'.<sup>5</sup> It is unlikely to be only a coincidence that Richardson should single out for adverse comment a play which revealed, not only the romance lineage of his heroine's name, but its great appeal to the novel-reading girls of his day. It is more likely to be an unconscious attempt to cover up the secret of his success, a success which allowed him the luxury of supercilious contempt for poor Biddy's longings. He had discovered how to satisfy them within the limits of the strictest morality; the cere-

<sup>1</sup> *A Collection of Entertaining Histories and Novels* (London, 1739), i. 165.

<sup>2</sup> *History of Christian Names*, i. 485-6.

<sup>3</sup> See his *Correspondence*, i. 121-2.

<sup>4</sup> Pt. 2, Letter LIV.

<sup>5</sup> Act II, Sc. i.

monies of law and baptism have fitted his heroine for a triumph as dazzling as any in romance.

For *Pamela*, of course, is romance with a difference. The central character is not only Pamela, the arcadian heroine, all simple innocence and artless beauty; she is also the poor Miss Andrews who has her way to make in the world. The love theme is suggested by her christian name, but it is given a realistic setting by a surname which involves her in the world of family, material, and religious obligations. The conflict of the two roles—Pamela against Miss Andrews—is the essence of the novel; and thereby Richardson initiates the new development of fiction in the eighteenth century, which sets the romantic or aspirational side of personality against a realistically presented background of domestic environment and external necessity.

Richardson, characteristically, allows his heroine to manipulate both roles to her advantage. Sometimes, as the helpless Miss Andrews, she stays to endure her cruel fate in Mr. B.'s household, because she is resolved 'not to return back and be a clog upon her dear parents'.<sup>1</sup> But the poverty and servitude of Miss Andrews is not allowed to limit Pamela's pastoral freedom from necessity:

Bread and water I can live upon anywhere with content. Water I shall get anywhere; and if I can't get bread I will live, like a bird in winter, upon hips and haws, and at other times upon pignuts, potatoes and turnips.<sup>2</sup>

Her independence from the obligations of her status, though not enough to remove her completely from the toils, is quite sufficient to baffle Mr. B., accustomed as he is to the proper subordination of the poor, and surprised by such an inappropriate 'romantic turn for virtue'.<sup>3</sup> He ascribes it to her reading habits—'the girl's head is turned by romances and such idle stuff',<sup>4</sup> he complains, only to discover that her father's head is 'turned with them'<sup>5</sup> too. Finally he is forced to accept Pamela Andrews as a complete person, and renounces his earlier certainty that he could make 'Pamela change her name, without either Act of Parliament, or wedlock, and be Sally Godwin the Second'.<sup>5</sup>

Richardson has endowed his heroine more richly than Mr. B. for this struggle. It is difficult to attribute a full and complex personality to a mere cipher, and, consequently, he remains a lay figure in a 'secret history', with no more reality in the novel than he had originally as the subject of a piece of whispered gossip about the local squire.

The choice of the letter 'B' was particularly disastrous. As soon as 'Mr.

<sup>1</sup> Pt. I, Letter I.

<sup>2</sup> Pt. I, Letter XXVIII. See also XXX, XXXII.

<sup>3</sup> Pt. I, Letter XXXI.

<sup>4</sup> Pt. I, Letter XXVI.    <sup>5</sup> Pt. I, Letter XXXI, Journal, 'Thursday'.

B.' became 'Squire Booby' in *Shamela*, Richardson's bluff was called. He had already confessed in the Introduction to the second edition of *Pamela* that 'an anonymous gentleman' had pressed him to 'avoid the Idea apt to be join'd with the word "Squire", by styling him "Sir James or Sir John &c"'. But he had rejected the suggestion, proclaiming a lofty disregard for 'double entendres' and refusing to 'see how Greatness, from Titles, can add Likeness, or Power, to the Passions'. Later, in the Preface to Part II, he returned to the theme, and justified the retention of 'Mr. B.' by the 'Necessity, for obvious Reasons, to vary and disguise, some Facts and Circumstances, and also the Names of Persons, Places, &c'.

There were, no doubt, several 'obvious reasons' why Richardson did not invent a name for Mr. B., although he had invented a full one for his heroine. He could justify himself by the strong tradition against naming the nobility and gentry in writing,<sup>1</sup> and it is probable that he wished to turn the convention to account by retaining, whether justified or not, the suggestive and saleable aura of a true scandal of high life. Dr. Johnson—no credulous reader—thought that 'a writer does not feign a name of which he only gives the initial letter',<sup>2</sup> and Richardson certainly wished to give such an impression. But there are other reasons why Mr. B. remains a cipher. Richardson's interest was focused upon the heroine, and any increase in the reality of her antagonist would have undermined the credibility of her interpretation of the story; a more convincing Mr. B., validated by a complete name, would have revealed the fact that names, and lack of names, are a part of the legerdemain which allows Pamela her triumph.

This was one of the lessons enforced in *Shamela*. Everyone, as an epigram in the *London Magazine* for June 1741 pointed out,

Admir'd *Pamela*, till *Shamela* shown,  
Appear'd in every Colour—but her own:<sup>3</sup>

The mere substitution of the names 'Shamela' and 'Mr. Booby' for 'Pamela' and 'Mr. B.' in an otherwise unaltered *Pamela* would have forced the reader to interpret Richardson's whole story in the light of Fielding's ironic exposure.

It is possible that in choosing the name Richardson was himself unconsciously aware of the ambiguities of Pamela's character and motivation. Mrs. Barbauld pointed out<sup>4</sup> that the following lines from Pope's *Epistle to Miss Blount, with the Works of Voiture* provide something like Fielding's interpretation of *Pamela*:

<sup>1</sup> See H. T. Buckle, *History of Civilisation in England* (London, 1858), i. 238, fn.

<sup>2</sup> *Lives of the English Poets*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1905), iii. 381.

<sup>3</sup> Cit. A. D. McKillop, *Samuel Richardson* (Chapel Hill, 1936), p. 74.

<sup>4</sup> *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, i. lxvi.

The Gods, to curse Pamela with her prayers,  
Gave the gilt coach and dappled Flanders mares,  
The shining robes, rich jewels, beds of state,  
And, to complete her bliss, a fool for mate.<sup>1</sup>

The connotations of her name, then, seem to carry the same varied possibilities of interpretation as are suggested by her actions—possibilities ranging from Sidney's pastoral princess to Pope's designing *arriviste*. This ambiguity—a commonplace of criticism both then and later—is, of course, closely related to the phenomenal success of the novel itself, which accommodated itself to the tastes of all types of readers, from learned clerics to the Biddy Tipkinses of the day. Richardson's achievement can be appraised in terms of the skill with which he made the public forget that 'Pamela' was a romance name and forced it to think of its bearer as a problematic but convincingly real person.

'Clarissa', too, is a romance name, and in his greatest novel Richardson makes us forget it even more completely. It is the name of Huon's sister in *Huon of Bordeaux*, and it had been used in a 1737 romance whose title may have attracted Richardson—*The History of Clorana, the beautiful Arcadian, or Virtue Rewarded*.<sup>2</sup> It is used, as a typical romance name, by Pope in *The Rape of the Lock*,<sup>3</sup> and, in the form 'Claricia', by Scudéry in *Clelia*.<sup>4</sup> The name had also become debased to some extent and was used as a conventional name for the nymphs of the town; it occurs with this sense in the *Tatler*,<sup>5</sup> and in Robert Dodsley's 1748 *Collection of Poems by Several Hands*.<sup>6</sup>

But 'Clarissa' has other connotations. It was used for pathetic heroines of stories in the *Female Tatler*<sup>7</sup> and the *Universal Spectator*,<sup>8</sup> and the Clarissa of Young's *Night Thoughts* dies in giving birth to the rake Lorenzo's child.<sup>9</sup> It also has a more remote religious flavour, well suited to Richardson's chaste bride of Christ, from the Clarisse, an order of nuns founded by Santa Chiara, and still flourishing in the eighteenth century. The root derivation, from *clarus*, is equally suited to his paragon of virtue.

The name, then, combines an emphatic romance ancestry with mingled overtones of fashionable gallantry, religious abnegation, and the pathos of an early and tragic death. It thus has the same complex and apparently

<sup>1</sup> ll. 49-52. It was first published in 1712.

<sup>2</sup> Cit. Brian W. Downs, *Samuel Richardson* (London, 1928), p. 159.

<sup>3</sup> Canto III, ll. 127-30 (1714 ed.).

<sup>4</sup> See Helen Sard Hughes, 'Characterisation in *Clarissa Harlowe* [sic]', *J.E.G.P.* xiii (1914), 115.

<sup>5</sup> 'I said for instance *Chloe* and *Clarissa* are two eminent toasts. A Gentleman (who keeps his greyhound and gun, and one could think might know better) told me he supposed they were Papishes, for their names were not English' (18 June 1709).

<sup>6</sup> ii. 224-7.

<sup>7</sup> 8 Aug. 1709.

<sup>8</sup> 18 Oct. 1729.

<sup>9</sup> *Night*, v, ll. 586-8.



contradictory appropriateness as that of his first heroine. But before considering this appropriateness more fully, the effect of its use, standing alone, in the title, requires comment.

Richardson knew that his heroine's christian name sounded like an amatory *nom de guerre*. Lovelace reports and comments on the following conversation with Miss Rawlins:

... You heard me call her *my Clarissa*.

—I did, but thought it to be a feigned or love-name, said Miss Rawlins.

I wonder what is Miss Rawlins love-name, Jack. Most of the fair romancers have in their early womanhood chosen love-names. No parson ever gave more *real* names than I have given *fictitious* ones. And to very good purpose: many a sweet dear has answered me a letter for the sake of owning a name which her godmother never gave her.<sup>1</sup>

Richardson, then, was fully aware of the lure of romantic love-names, and of how a seducer could use them to suggest the attractions of love *in vacuo*, removed from the inhibiting context of parson or godmother. Yet he gave his chaste heroine such a name, and made it stand alone on his title-page.

In his own life Richardson continued the puritan tradition which opposed the use of christian names even between husband and wife.<sup>2</sup> In *Clarissa* itself he moralizes on the subject, presenting the fall of Sally Martin as implicit in her indulgence in this matter:

... She knew the *Christian*, as well as *surname*, of every pretty fellow who frequented public places; and affected to speak of them by their former.<sup>3</sup>

Using christian names was a verbal flaunting of promiscuous intimacy, but the titles of his first two novels imply such an intimacy.

This, of course, was a fairly common convention for novel-titles. *Sir Charles Grandison* makes the general contrast clear—the use of a single, christian name for women, but of a full name for men, is part of a tacit discrimination between the sexes which is traditional in the novel, and which is reflected in the traditional novel-title. Against *Joseph Andrews*, *Tom Jones*, *Sir Charles Grandison*, *Tristram Shandy*, *Roderick Random*, we can set *Pamela*, *Clarissa*, *Amelia*, *Evelina*, *Emma*. The use of the christian name only for eponymous heroines suggests that whereas the novel-hero is traditionally accorded a complete social being combining both public and private functions, the novel-heroine is defined merely as an object for

<sup>1</sup> *Clarissa* ('Everyman Edition', London, 1932), iii, Letter V.

<sup>2</sup> See William Gouge's popular *Of Domestical Duties* (1622), cit. L. B. Wright, *Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Chapel Hill, 1935), p. 222. Richardson's own practice can be seen in his correspondence and in the usage of the characters of whom he approves in the novels—both of a Victorian formality.

<sup>3</sup> 'Conclusion supposed to be written by Mr. Belford', iv. 537.

arousing, and eventually reciprocating, the passion of romantic love. She is herself without any complete or stable social personality until male generosity has endowed her with the essential attribute of a surname, a surname whose acquisition is assumed to be her main purpose in life, and whose ceremonial ratification in marriage therefore ends her story.

*Clarissa, or The History of a Young Lady*, belies the expectation aroused by its title's acquiescence in this tradition. Clarissa's greatness lies in her rejection of any such limitation of her freedom, and Richardson's success in transcending the traditional treatment of the novel-heroine is shown by the way that his masterpiece is very often spoken of, not as *Clarissa*, but as 'Clarissa Harlowe'.<sup>1</sup>

Her family name persists, obstinately, and the background which it invokes is mobilized as an essential part of her tragic dilemma; the varied possibilities suggested by her christian name are all subject to the limitations of her social and family environment. She is only free to act, to realize her destiny, by escaping from the safe, but infinitely restricted role of being Miss Harlowe: and it is because she has eventually secured this freedom that she can be degraded by a lover whose desire for Clarissa is poisoned by his hatred for all the Harlowes—'Harlowe! How that hated name sticks in my throat—but I shall give her for it the name of love [i.e. Lovelace].'<sup>2</sup> His plan to abase in her the name of Harlowe, before raising her up to the name of Lovelace, destroys them both: and this because, contrary to his—and the novel-reader's—expectation, Clarissa's aim in life is much more than the acquisition of a new surname.

An essential element in the greater dramatic intensity of Richardson's second novel is the fact that Robert Lovelace, unlike Mr. B., has a complete name, and one which seems to be intricately related to the complexity of his relationship with Clarissa.

Popular memory has confused the names Lovelace and Lothario; the former name remains in France as a type of the dashing rake, although Lothario has replaced it in this sense in England.<sup>3</sup> This suggests a general tendency to overlook some aspects of Richardson's Lovelace which are too bestial to be described by the character-type rake, and, forgetting the brutal climax of his career, to stress his similarity to Lothario in Rowe's *The Fair Penitent*.

Johnson thought that 'the character of Lothario seems to have been

<sup>1</sup> The practice ruffled Saintsbury's academic calm. He wrote, in the preface to the 'Everyman Edition', '*Clarissa*, which (for some inexplicable reason) illiterate people will call *Clarissa Harlowe*'. But the tendency was stronger than he knew; underneath his initials, in the bibliography, we can read '*Clarissa Harlowe, 1748*'. The first, and most later editions use '*The History of Miss Clarissa Harlowe*' as the headline.

<sup>2</sup> i, Letter XXXI.

<sup>3</sup> See *D.N.B.*, Lovelace, Richard.

expanded into that of Lovelace', although he found that only Richardson had produced the correct 'moral effect' of losing 'the hero in the villain'.<sup>1</sup> Richardson himself, as in the parallel case of *Pamela* and *The Fair Penitent*, went out of his way to bring forward the analogy, only to reject it scornfully. 'Calista', he makes Belford comment, after a comparison of the story with *The Fair Penitent*, is 'a luscious, desiring wench'.<sup>2</sup> But some of the unconscious associations of the names of Richardson's protagonists seem to reinforce the parallel which Richardson wished to exclude. For Lovelace has a pleasant-sounding name, that of a famous cavalier family,<sup>3</sup> as well as that of the rake in Vanbrugh's *Relapse*, under the form 'Loveless'; and the overtone of 'love-less' can suggest unrequited passion, as well as hard-heartedness. In both of Clarissa Harlowe's names, on the other hand, we can perhaps detect suggestions of sexual guilt. 'Clarissa' is very like 'Calista', whose name had become a byword of feminine frailty;<sup>4</sup> and 'Harlowe' is the closest proper name to 'harlot'.

Freud has given many examples of the reappearance of repressed words and ideas in disguised forms, and shown how they are especially prone to affect our memory of proper names.<sup>5</sup> The literary historian—perhaps fortunately—rarely knows enough about an author to follow him into this private and unconscious world, and the path of such inquiries is strewn with examples of scholarly absurdity arising from the elaboration of far-fetched coincidences. In this case, however, we know enough about Richardson to be able to amplify the present suggestion. His treatment of Sally Godwin in *Pamela*, and of Sally Martin, Polly Horton, and Mrs. Sinclair in *Clarissa*, the fact that both these novels require the tacit assumption that the passions of his heroines are aroused by rakes, together with his own interest in fallen women and in the 'Magdalen Charity'<sup>6</sup>—all these suggest an obsessional interest in criminal sexuality, an incompletely mastered striving for the kind of experience that 'Mr. B.' and Lovelace represent. It is likely that Richardson had a deep unconscious investment in his hero's sadistic attempts to violate Clarissa, and that it was this identification which allowed Lovelace to emerge as a more attractive character than his bestial role warrants. When Richardson discovered, before the publication of the last volumes of *Clarissa*, that Lovelace was still popular

<sup>1</sup> *Lives*, ed. cit., ii. 67.

<sup>2</sup> iv, Letter LII.

<sup>3</sup> The last holder of the title, Nevil, Lord Lovelace, was 'a man of letters, a friend to the muses, and highly fashioned according to the breeding of those days' [S. Jenyns, *Works* (London, 1790), i, 40. fn.]. He died in 1736 (*D.N.B.*).

<sup>4</sup> See Pope, *Moral Essays*, ii, 'Of the Characters of Women', 28-31.

<sup>5</sup> An acceptance of the unconscious connotations of names is not, of course, restricted to the psycho-analytic school; they can be explained, for example, in terms of eighteenth-century associationism, or of the linguistic principle of unconscious analogy established in Hermann Paul's *Prinzipien* (1880).

<sup>6</sup> See Brewster, *Aaron Hill*, p. 263, and Richardson's *Correspondence*, i. clv, v. 97.

with his readers, he revised his treatment to make it more severe, and made his abhorrence explicit in footnotes.<sup>1</sup> But although Richardson's unconscious identification with his hero's purpose was balked of overt satisfaction, it was not wholly repressed. We can still find traces of it in the names he chose for his protagonists; the pleasant overtones of the name Robert Lovelace suggest a more favourable bias towards him than Richardson could openly reveal, and in the hidden associations of his heroine's name he seems, unconsciously, to have accomplished his otherwise thwarted aim of degradation.

There is no space here to supplement this suggestion with a more detailed analysis;<sup>2</sup> it is only a highly tentative attempt to illustrate how the complexity of Richardson's attitude to his characters is reflected in the very varied associations of their names.

This wealth of implication can be discovered even in his last and, by general consent, most tedious work. Sir Charles Grandison's name combines the flourish of rank, a non-biblical christian name<sup>3</sup> with a royal flavour, and a surname which happily combines the suggestion of grandeur with a flattering derivation from the Irish peerage, of which Richardson was certainly aware.<sup>4</sup> In his last novel Richardson was in the calmer waters of self-adulation, and certainly he could not have chosen an aristocratic name more similar to his own. But even in the name of the perfect man we can detect a train of thought which suggests Richardson's suppressed admiration of rakery. The most famous bearer of the name 'Grandison' was Barbara, Duchess of Cleveland, mistress of Charles II: it is possible that the collocation Charles-Grandison may have originated in Richardson's mind through their historic association.

### III

Fielding was a far less subjective novelist than Richardson, and the names of his characters do not show the complex, over-determined associations

<sup>1</sup> See *Correspondence*, i. lxxxix. Belford's caveat against the coupling of Calista and Clarissa occurs in the last volume.

<sup>2</sup> See Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (Baton Rouge, 1941), pp. 25-6, 66, for comparable examples. In a more detailed study it might also be necessary to reconsider the possible model for Lovelace. Both Wharton and Lord Euston have been suggested as the prototypes of Lovelace, and of Young's Lorenzo, also associated with a Clarissa; and Johnson, in hinting at a definite model for Lorenzo, also introduces the names of Lovelace and Calista, in the 'Life of Young'.

<sup>3</sup> There was a growing prejudice against biblical names, more especially Old Testament names like Richardson's own. See Edward Mangin, *An Essay on Light Reading* (London, 1808), pp. 107-8.

<sup>4</sup> The second Viscount is mentioned several times in the letters of Sir Thomas Rowe, which Richardson owned, edited, and printed [Dottin, *Revue anglo-américaine*, vii (1929), 55-9]. The contemporary bearer of the title was an acquaintance of Richardson's friends, the Delanys (*Letters of Mrs. Delany, To Mrs. Dewes*, 2 Nov. 1751).

that we have been discussing. He came to the novel from quite different traditions—from the classics, comedy, and satire. Hence his characters, especially his secondary ones but also his first two heroes, tend to have the traditional 'characteristic names' of comedy, reflecting Fielding's pre-occupation with 'not men but manners'.

Fielding makes Joseph Andrews explain his name in a letter to Pamela recounting his glorious resistance to the overtures of his mistress.<sup>1</sup> His surname shows him rivalling his sister's illustrious chastity, and his christian name supports his pretensions by recalling the story of Potiphar's wife. Of the other characters in *Joseph Andrews*, 'few . . . are endowed with English surnames—none outside the Adams, Andrews, and Wilson families'.<sup>2</sup>

These few realistic names form a strong contrast with the facetious names given to low and comic characters. In each succeeding novel Fielding decreased the proportion of characters whose names alone were enough to show that they were seen entirely from a comic or satiric point of view. For the majority of names which 'had a more modern Termination',<sup>3</sup> Fielding may have been indebted to the list of subscribers to the 1724 folio edition of Gilbert Burnet's *History of his Own Time*, which he is known to have owned. The list includes: Thomas Jones, H. Partridge, several Westerns, William James, Atkinson, Bennett, Booth, Edwards, Harrison, Millar, Matthews, and Trent.<sup>4</sup> This may be a mere coincidence, as Cross believes,<sup>5</sup> but the inclusiveness of the list suggests rather strongly that Fielding had recourse to a random method of selection, much as later writers have used directories.

It is in any case certain that these realistic names in Fielding are very commonplace, and do not seek particularity. The name 'Tom Jones', for example, symbolizes the high degree of generality which Fielding sought. As a founding, the hero bears the christian name of his godfather, Thomas Allworthy, and the surname of his putative mother, Jenny Jones.<sup>6</sup> The result, though explained in terms of the practice of his day, is a compound of two of the commonest names in the language.<sup>7</sup>

Fielding thought of the name 'Tom' as typically unheroic. He discussed it in a *Champion* paper on the superstitions about names:

The first I shall mention is Thomas. It is, I believe, pretty certain, that there

<sup>1</sup> *Joseph Andrews*, Bk. I, ch. 10.

<sup>2</sup> W. L. Cross, *History of Henry Fielding* (New Haven, 1918), i. 342.

<sup>3</sup> The anonymous author of the 1751 *Essay Upon the New Species of Writing founded by Mr. Fielding* noted the difference between them and names that 'bore some reference to the character' (p. 18).

<sup>4</sup> *N. & Q.*, 26 Nov. 1898, p. 426.

<sup>5</sup> Cross, *op. cit.* i. 343.

<sup>6</sup> *Tom Jones*, Bk. I, ch. 6, and Bk. II, ch. 2.

<sup>7</sup> See Withycombe, *op. cit.*, p. xxii.



hath been formerly some very remarkable silly fellow of this appellation, whence this name is transferred with no great honour. Witness Tom Fool, Tom Dingle, Cousin Tom, Silly Tom, and the application of it to the most insignificant of birds, namely, a Tom-Tit.<sup>1</sup>

As though to emphasize its low associations, there were two somewhat scandalous contemporary bearers of the name 'Tom Jones', whom Fielding had some reason to know about. In a well-known pamphlet issued by Curll, *Causes of Divorce*,<sup>2</sup> one John Dormer, Esq., cited 'Tom Jones, his footman', who 'derived his birth from the dregs of the populace' and had 'dared to commit the vilest acts of lewdness with his master's wife'. Another Thomas Jones was a well-known highwayman, and had his life reprinted from Alexander Smith's *Histories of Highwaymen*, in Captain Charles Johnson's *General History of the Lives and Adventures of the most Famous Highwaymen, Murderers, Street-Robbers &c. . . .*, immediately after the life of Jonathan Wild.<sup>3</sup>

It is not likely, however, that these two individuals typify Fielding's dominant attitude towards the name 'Tom Jones'. It was much too generalized for that. It is used in a 1743 pamphlet as a type name for a soldier,<sup>4</sup> and there were several other more reputable bearers of the name in Fielding's day.<sup>5</sup> It was almost certainly selected by Fielding—whether from the Burnet list of subscribers or not—because it was free from the 'strange kind of magick bias' of most names and belonged to the class of 'neutral names' of which Mr. Shandy, giving 'Tom', 'Jack', and 'Dick' as examples, affirmed:

that there had been as many knaves and fools, at least, as wise and good men, since the world began, who had indifferently borne them;—so that, like equal forces acting against each other in contrary directions, he thought they mutually destroyed each other's effects.<sup>6</sup>

Fielding's Tom Jones is emphatically no hero of romance, but an

<sup>1</sup> 7 June 1740. He had already shown this attitude in *Tom Thumb*. On the other hand, Thomas Heartfree, in *Jonathan Wild*, is a good man.

<sup>2</sup> Attributed in Curll's best manner to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It went through several editions, and is included in 'Leonora's Library' (*Spectator*, 12 Apr. 1711) under the heading *Fielding's Trial*. The volume's first subject was the case of Fielding's bigamous relative 'Beau Fielding'. This, and Fielding's own interest in marriage laws (see *Covent Garden Journal*, 68), may have led him to read the work. The quotation is from the 1735 title-page.

<sup>3</sup> 1st ed. 1734: his main offence, like that of the footman and of Fielding's hero, was sexual—he was hanged for robbing and raping a farmer's wife.

<sup>4</sup> *A True Dialogue between Thomas Jones a Trooper . . . and John Smith a Serjeant . . .* printed for B. C. in Paternoster-Row, 1743.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. the Chaplain of St. Saviour's, Southwark (1727–62), and the secretary of 'The Most Honourable and Loyal Society of Ancient Britons'. (See 1717 pamphlet, *The Rise and Progress of the . . . Society of Ancient Britons*, in B.M. Cat.)

<sup>6</sup> *Tristram Shandy*, Bk. I, ch. 19.



exemplar of the growing male who 'bad as he is, must serve for the hero of this story'.<sup>1</sup> His author viewed the development of 'little Tommy' in the detached light of intellectual comedy, and he must have been surprised when the public, trained on the vicarious identification that Richardson had done so much to foster, began to consider Tom Jones as a pattern of conduct with which Fielding as a person must necessarily be associated.<sup>2</sup> The name alone should have made clear, if Fielding's stated intentions for the comic prose epic were not enough, that no uncritical vicarious identification of any kind was intended.<sup>3</sup>

In his last novel Fielding took one of the commonest polite names of the day for his title. The name 'Amelia' barely fulfils the definition of novel-heroines given by Polly Honeycombe's nurse—'women with hard christian names', and certainly does not have such an immediate romance-connotation as 'Pamela' and 'Clarissa' do. It is in fact a compromise between the traditional type of heroine's name and the requirements of Fielding's sombre theme. He could not symbolize his real subject in the title, for to have called a novel 'Mrs. Booth' would have outraged the expectations of the reading public with its 'barbarous genealogy'.<sup>4</sup> Fielding went a long way in his struggle against the conventional romantic definition of the heroine; but the novel had to wait until *Eugénie Grandet* and *Anna Karenina* for titles where the inclusion of the heroine's surname emphatically asserts the social and family setting as an essential element of the story, and until *Madame Bovary* for a title which proclaims that its subject is the fate of a woman after marriage.<sup>5</sup>

There is one set of associations in the names of the hero and heroine of *Amelia* which may reflect Fielding's re-appraisal of Richardson. In *Shamela* and *Joseph Andrews*, Mr. B. is called 'Booby', and the implied judgement is just in the light of prevailing aristocratic standards. But in *Amelia*, Fielding no longer condones lapses from male chastity; he demonstrates the suffering which the double standard inflicts on the wife. The name 'Booth' can be seen as another possible filling-out of Richardson's 'Mr. B.'—a hidden atonement for 'Booby'. This possibility is given slight support by Austin Dobson's statement that 'in some later editions of *Pamela*, an endeavour has been made to neutralize this outrage (i.e. 'Mr. Booby' for 'Mr. B.' in *Shamela* by revealing 'Mr. B.' as 'Mr.

<sup>1</sup> *Tom Jones*, Bk. III, ch. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See *Correspondence of Richardson*, iv. 280-1, and F. T. Blanchard, *Fielding the Novelist* (New Haven, 1926), pp. 28-70.

<sup>3</sup> *Old England*, 16 Dec. 1749, hopes that whores 'will hardly for the future be so very fond of calling their Pensioners by the name of *Tom Jones*, nor the Fribbles their Harlots by that of *Sophia*' (cit. Blanchard, op. cit., p. 42).

<sup>4</sup> Biddy Tipkins's phrase in *The Tender Husband*, II. i.

<sup>5</sup> There are many exceptions to these generalizations: e.g. *Fanny Hill* (1745), *Mrs. Armytage* (1836).

Boothby'.<sup>1</sup> Since no such edition (and it was in any case a modern edition of which Dobson spoke)<sup>2</sup> has been found, we can only be certain that the sequence 'B.—Booby—Booth' has led at least one student of Richardson to amplify the series with 'Boothby'. But it is at least possible that Fielding's selection of the name Booth was an unconscious reparation for his previous parody of Richardson's peccant lover. This view is supported by the parallel euphonic progression of the names of the heroines—'Pamela'—'Shamela'—'Amelia'—a progression which was evidently noted by an anonymous parodist who completed it by announcing for publication, shortly after the appearance of *Amelia*, 'Shamelia, a Novel'.<sup>3</sup>

Despite the shift in emphasis shown in *Amelia*, with its much-increased proportion of realistic names, the main contrast between the use of personal names by Richardson and Fielding remains unchanged. Richardson has no theoretical bias towards the representative. His vicarious participation in the private and often unconscious complexities of personal life is reflected in the names he uses, names which suggest the unique individuality of his main characters, and round which cluster all kinds of complex and yet obscurely relevant associations. Fielding, on the other hand, avoids suggesting, even in their names, that his characters are unique human beings. Even his protagonists have conspicuously common names, and the degree of their individualization is further reduced by their setting in a social framework where other people have only incomplete or 'characteristic' names. The reality of Tom Jones, for example, is limited by his dealings with Blifil and Allworthy, and takes on some of the incompleteness of a foster-brother who has no christian name, and a godfather who is only the embodiment of 'all' that his creator considered 'worthy'. Fielding's use of names is therefore in agreement with the assertions of his critical writing: that his interest as a novelist lies in those aspects of character which are representative of all mankind.

<sup>1</sup> Dobson, *Samuel Richardson* (London, 1902), p. 43, fn. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Reported by Aleya Lyell Reade, 'Richardson's Pamela: her Original', *N. & Q.*, 27 June 1908, p. 503.

<sup>3</sup> See Cross, *op. cit.*, ii. 335. The work has not survived.

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### THE HAND OF ÆSCHERE: A NOTE ON *BEOWULF* 1343

IN *Beowulf* 1343 f. the scene is Heorot on the morrow of Æschere's death. Before the assembled Danes and Geats King Hrothgar bitterly laments the loss of his old trusted friend, confidant, and counsellor, and declares it to be a national disaster, for many a thegn a distress grievous to bear,

hreperbealo hearde, nu seo hand ligeð  
se þe eow welhwylcra wilna dohte.

That is, 'now the hand lies still which served you well in all your desires', and so, in Fr. Klaeber's rendering,<sup>1</sup> 'which was good (liberal) to you as regards all good things', taking a special reference to generous dealings from the term *sincgyfa* applied to Æschere just previously (1342). The expression would perhaps sound a rather forced note were the immediate context not being echoed in some such way. A reference to the generous hand goes well with *sincgyfa*, whether this term is taken to mean that Æschere had been accustomed to act as Hrothgar's treasurer or as his deputy in the dispensing of the royal favours, or whether the interesting suggestion is adopted that Hrothgar chooses for Æschere terms like 'treasure-giver', normally reserved for a prince or king, because he is anxious to give the dead man the highest possible praise,

When Hrothgar calls Æschere, who had been killed by Grendel's mother, a prince, although he was but a retainer, he is true to the emotional state he is in at the moment; by exaggerating, he expresses best his love for the man.<sup>2</sup>

Klaeber has suggested<sup>3</sup> that the reference to Æschere's hand may be an allusion to the English legend of King Oswald, who according to Bede did so much good in life that long after his death his right hand remained uncorrupted. The idea is ingenious, but it seems to me intrinsically improbable that one isolated and not very explicit reference to native traditions should have been abruptly introduced at this point in the poem. Certainly there is no need to reckon with outside influences for the reference to the hand when the expression may be satisfactorily explained from the

<sup>1</sup> *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*, 3rd ed. (Boston, 1936; reissued with Supplement, 1941), p. 182.

<sup>2</sup> R. Roussev, *Beowulf* (Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Faculté historico-philologique, xxxiii. 8), 1937, p. 63. Roussev's essay, a useful introduction (in Russian) to the poem as a work of art, seems to have been largely overlooked in accounts of recent *Beowulf* criticism.

<sup>3</sup> *Anglia*, 1 (1926), 200 n.; cf. ed. cit., pp. cxxiii, n. 4, 182.

poem itself. For Æschere's hand here is not a mere metonymy for his whole person, but is surely meant to remind us of the hand and arm of Grendel to which so much prominence has been given before l. 1343 f. When, only two nights earlier, Beowulf wrestles with Grendel in Heorot, he succeeds in wrenching off the monster's arm from the shoulder (815-18), and though Grendel escapes he is forced to leave the hand and arm lying there behind him (*hond alegde*, 834). Next morning Hrothgar as he comes to Heorot sees, from outside the hall,<sup>1</sup> the gruesome relic prominently displayed, perhaps on a ledge or shelf over the entrance (925-7); Beowulf alludes to the hand, arm, and shoulder in his speech reviewing the conflict (970-2), and when he has done speaking the assembled warriors are deeply impressed as they gaze upon the mighty claw, which is then described in some detail (982-90). That same night is Æschere's doom, for it is then that Grendel's mother avenges her son's defeat by raiding Heorot, seizing Æschere, and bearing off his body, together with her son's bloody and already notorious arm, *under heolfre genam cupe folme* (1302 f.), which she apparently snatches up as she rushes from the hall. In his later recapitulation of the adventure, before King Hygelac, Beowulf does not forget to mention Grendel's hand (2098 f.). In l. 1343 f., then, it looks very much as if Hrothgar is thinking of both the arm of Grendel and the hand of Æschere as contrasted symbols of the new adversity which has suddenly fallen upon the Danes. He has no need to recall to his hearers how they had enjoyed a brief respite from their distress while its symbol, Grendel's claw, lay there for all to see. To make his point he need only mention that now Æschere's hand, symbol of all their prosperity and happiness, lies equally still in death. In other words, the respite is over and the distress renewed.

But may we not go farther and assume that in l. 1343 f. Hrothgar actually has Æschere's hand before him? That Grendel's mother, as part of her carefully planned vengeance, had left the hand in place of her son's arm? Hrothgar's words would then take on a truly dramatic and vivid colour: as he spoke of the slain favourite he might be imagined as pointing

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. D. Elizabeth Martin-Clarke, in *Culture in Early Anglo-Saxon England* (Baltimore, 1947), p. 74 f., has revived the old suggestion that Hrothgar is thought of as standing inside the hall, 'nearby the pillar' (*on stapole*, 926), when he views Grendel's arm, which was displayed 'up in the open-timbered roof' (*ofer heanne hrof*, 983) and 'under the spreading roof-tree' (*under geapne hrof*, 836). But archaeological evidence does not appear to have dispelled the ambiguity concerning the references in ll. 836 and 983, while such an interpretation places an undue strain upon the preposition *on* in 926; cf. Klaeber's note, ed. cit., p. 166. A further point, not mentioned by Klaeber, in support of a position outside the hall for Grendel's arm, is that Hrothgar takes in with his glance not only the arm but 'the steep roof gleaming with gold' (*geseah steapne hrof golde fahne ond Grendles hond*, 926 f.), which better suits the exterior of Heorot; compare the sight Beowulf and his men have of it shining forth with gold as they march up from the shore (307 f., 311).

to the hand in emphasis and proof of his sombre pronouncements; or we might think of the hand as left outside Heorot in the very place where Grendel's claw had lain, so that Hrothgar's audience would already have been stirred by the sight of the substituted symbol as they came into the hall. For Grendel's mother to have plotted and played such a fiendish trick is well in keeping with the demon-like character assigned to her kin. Moreover, we should then be provided with an illuminating analogy and motivation otherwise lacking for a subsequent incident of the story. When in his turn Beowulf, accompanied by Danes and Geats, and by Hrothgar in person (1592), sets out in a lofty spirit of vengeance for the lair of Grendel's mother, it is on the cliff overlooking the haunted mere wherein she dwells that Æschere's head is discovered. At the sight grief surges up for 'all the Danes', as it had done at Hrothgar's words back in Heorot (1417-21):

Denum eallum wæs,  
winum Scyldinga weorce on mode  
to gepolianne, ðegne monegum,  
oncyð eorla gehwæm, syðþan Æscheres  
on þam holmclife hafelan metton.

The grief of the Danes is all the more poignant if they are thought of as comparing the sad relic, left as it were on the very threshold of the Grendel abode, with the arm of Grendel which had been displayed at the threshold of their own hall. When Beowulf has triumphed in the grim struggle beneath the mere, he cuts off the head of the already dead Grendel (not, be it noted, any part of the mother troll he has come to destroy), and has it carried back to Heorot, a heavy burden even for four men (1637-9); it is dragged by its hair into the hall, to be gazed upon with mingled awe and relief by the assembled warriors (1647-50). Why is Grendel's head thus chosen for the token of Beowulf's success? It is sometimes assumed, on the evidence of folk-lore analogies, that in an earlier version of the story the hero had only wounded the monster in the first fight and must fight it once more in its lair before it was finally dispatched.

In the original form of the story, it appears, the male demon had been merely wounded; when the hero had made his way to the dwelling-place of the monsters, he put the wounded enemy to death (and afterwards killed the mother).<sup>1</sup>

Is not a more forthright explanation possible, that Beowulf, appreciating the renewed grief of the Danes and their king at finding Æschere's head in such a place, has with his characteristic consideration for others thought to restore their spirits by displaying before them, as it were in compensation, the head of their arch-enemy? And is there not an obvious connexion of

<sup>1</sup> Klaeber, ed. cit., p. xviii.

symbolism here between Æschere's head, compensated for with Grendel's head, and Grendel's arm, if considered as replaced by Æschere's hand? The poet, it is true, nowhere specifies that Æschere's hand is left behind or gives a reason why Grendel's head in particular is brought back to Heorot. But there is always a likelihood, in these incidents as elsewhere in the poem, that having to handle a considerable amount of narrative material the poet has occasionally overlooked or taken for granted motives and factual details, which were quite clear to his own mind, and has given us instead only their implications or the consequences arising from them.<sup>1</sup>

L. WHITBREAD

### THOMAS NASHE AND WILLIAM COTTON

NASHE's letter to William Cotton, which is transcribed in Appendix D to volume v of McKerrow's *Nashe*, is not of very great intrinsic worth. But when considered together with certain other items it can be seen to throw light on Nashe's career during the year 1596, in which it was written. To appreciate the full biographical value of the letter, however, it is desirable to seek the identity of Nashe's correspondent more closely than has yet been attempted. J. P. Collier, who first printed the letter (with serious omissions) in the *History of English Dramatic Poetry* (1831), mistakenly concluded that Nashe was addressing Mr. (afterwards Sir) Robert Cotton; and he used this conjecture as evidence of the 'respectable' status of Nashe's family. McKerrow wrote: 'The fact that it [the letter] is in the Cottonian collection suggests that he [Cotton] may have been some relation of Sir Robert, but I cannot learn of any member of the family at this date who was called William.' The plain 'Mr.' in Nashe's address to Cotton and the expression 'my worshipful freind' a few words farther back—to say nothing of the contents of the letter itself—must surely preclude the possibility, advanced by McKerrow, that Nashe was writing to William Cotton afterwards Bishop of Exeter. There are, however, other individuals by the name of William Cotton who would be known to one or more of Nashe's closest acquaintances about this time. The following notes may help to account for Nashe's own connexions with him.

McKerrow has shown that the letter must have been written between August and October 1596. At that period Nashe was living in London in straitened circumstances, as the supplicatory tone of his letter makes clear. How exactly he was earning a livelihood it is difficult to decide, though it

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Klaeber's remarks, ed. cit., p. lvii f. ('Lack of Steady Advance').



has been suggested that he was employed by John Danter, the publisher who eventually issued *Have With You to Saffron Walden* in September of that year. McKerrow believes that Nashe took up his residence with Danter after returning from the Isle of Wight in the autumn of 1593. There he had been a member of the household maintained by the Governor, Sir George Carey. We have only a vague idea as to how Nashe came to be on terms of such intimate friendship with the Carey family; but from two of his prefatory epistles we know that he found their company very congenial. In his short work *The Terrors of the Night*, in fact, he even goes so far as to say: 'Much more may I acknowledge all redundant prostrate vassallage to the royall descended Familie of the CAREYS: but for whom my spirit long ere this had expyred and my pen served as a puniard to gall my own heart' (*Works*, i. 375). And he always speaks highly of Sir George himself, that 'thrice noble and illustrious Chieftaine' of the Isle of Wight who must, according to others besides Nashe, have been an ideal patron of the arts.<sup>1</sup>

Of William Cotton it can be deduced from Nashe's letter that he was probably a person of some literary cultivation, though not as yet fully acquainted with Nashe's previous career. For anyone who had realized the full implications of *Pierce Pennilesse* would hardly need to be told (by Nashe): 'in towne I stayd (being earnestly inuited elsewhere) vpon had I wist hopes, & an after haruest I expected by writing for the stage & for the presse. . . .' Nashe may have refused the earnest invitation he speaks of out of a desire to remain independent at this time of day. Cotton was probably living somewhere in the provinces, and the latest literary intelligence from Paul's Churchyard would no doubt be acceptable to him. Nashe writes that the kind of work he has to offer is not in demand: ' . . . For the printers there is sutch gaping amongst them for the copy of my L[ord] of essex voyage & the ballet of the thre score & four knights, that though my lord Marquesse write a second part of his feuer lurden or idlenesse . . . or Churchyarde [en]large his Chips . . . yet wold they not giue for them the price of a [pr]oclamation out of date, or which is the contemptiblest summe [tha]t may bee (worse than a scute or a dandiprat) the price of [ ] Haruey's works bound vp together.' A reference to the *Metamorphosis of Ajax* leads on to topics of a very unsavoury nature. But in addition to these literary allusions the letter makes use of a certain amount of legal phraseology, the presence of which does not seem to be entirely fortuitous. The first simile, 'as vnfortunate as a terme at . . . St. Albons to poore cuntry clients', is followed by a mention of Jack Cade's dealing with the lawyers 'wherein they [the rebels] handg up the L[ord]

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, F. Bamford, *A Royalist's Notebook* (London, 1936), pp. 80-90; W. H. Long, *The Oglander Memoirs* (Newport, I.O.W., 1888).

cheif iustice'. Then there is a reference to the Lord Mayor's action restraining the players, and a practically illegible piece which runs (according to McKerrow's reading): 'Sr (?) John Smith himself shold g . . . ther . . . you (?) of his (?) foles (?) bolt.' McKerrow remarks: 'A few other letters may be guessed at but nothing which makes any sense. . . .' And he adds: 'This is a pity as one would have liked to know what Nashe had to say of Sir John Smith, who at the moment was a somewhat conspicuous person.' At the time Nashe wrote to Cotton, Sir John Smith was imprisoned in the Tower of London, having been arrested on a charge of treason and examined in the Star Chamber on 14 June 1596. His case, curious and amusing as it seems to us now from the pages of Strype's *Annals*, must have excited some slight interest among those who followed the progress of state trials, and Nashe would know the news value of this item to anyone out of touch with affairs in London. But he uses other legal terms in speaking of the 'proclamation out of date' and the ribald bequest of Gillian of Brentford: 'Sure had I beene of his [c]oūsayle he shold haue sett for y<sup>e</sup> mott or word before it. . . .' And he recalls an old 'innes of court trick'. The letter concludes with a legal phrase: 'yours in acknowledgement of the deepest bond'.

This smattering of legal phraseology suggests that Nashe knew in what direction some of William Cotton's interests were biased. Unfortunately we have no indication of the place to which the letter was sent. But we do know that there were at least two, and possibly three, persons by the name of William Cotton with whom Nashe's late patron, Sir George Carey, was acquainted. The one least likely to have had much to do with Carey or Nashe was a 'Mr William Cotton', Esquire of the county of Gloucester, who attended the funeral of Lady Katherine Berkeley on 20 May 1596. Another William Cotton is referred to in J. R. Dasent's *Acts of the Privy Council* for 1596-7. The document mentioned there is a letter sent to Sir George Carey on 7 November 1596 in which a 'Captain William Cotton' is named as leading a company of men levied for the defence of the Isle of Wight. Had Nashe been writing to Captain Cotton he would surely have mentioned the latter's military occupation. The third William Cotton—and the man most likely to have been Nashe's 'worshipful good freind'—is noticed in a curious circumstance described by John Smyth in the *Lives of the Berkeleys* (ed. Maclean, 1883, ii. 316). Sir George Carey's connexion with the Berkeley family, of course, came about through the marriage of his daughter Elizabeth with Thomas, son of Henry Berkeley and his wife Katherine, whose death has just been mentioned.

John Smyth tells us that in the Hilary term of 1597, Henry Berkeley was engaged in a lawsuit with the Countess of Warwick who had brought a writ of partition against him in respect of three manors for which he

pleaded a 'non-tenure in common'. Sir George Carey was present at the hearing of the case; but the jury on that occasion was suspected of not dealing impartially in the matter. As Smyth puts it:

One of which jury was ffancis Heydon, an Esquire dwelling in Hartfordshire but a ffreeholder in the County of Gloucester (as many others were resident in seven other Counties) sometimes a Counsellor at lawe, which was not unknown to this lord Henry nor to his Sollicitor, And therefore had been challenged (upon other suspicion of not standing indifferent) but that one William Cotton, a gent wholly depending on the said Lord Hunsdon, undertook for his indifference yea and favour as for his own soule, for soe to myself were his words when I told him the causes of my suspicion of him: whereto againe he replyed, That if hee were challenged we above measure weakened our tryall and good hopes, And that for him he would undertake at his perill, with other like confident words, wherein I assure myself he meant faythfully, though he was extraordinarily deceived. But surely many of this Jury were beforehand acquainted with the cause of both parties which was not unknown to either side. . . .

Smyth's description of this William Cotton as a 'gent wholly depending' on Sir George Carey gives the impression that he had been in Carey's service for some time: and it is therefore rather improbable that, as McKerrow suggested, he was 'evidently a man of means'. He must have been something more than merely a bailiff or an occupant of one of Carey's properties: and his amateur enthusiasm in this lawsuit affair lends some strength to the belief that he was the man to whom Nashe's letter was addressed. The fact that there is no further mention of him in the Cottonian papers may perhaps indicate that he was a 'scion' of the Cotton family, admitted into the Carey entourage as a tutor or secretary. Nashe apparently did not know him well enough to dispense entirely with the formal mode of address; he and Cotton may have come into one another's company in the south of England a year or two before 1596. And Nashe was acute enough to know which topics would arrest Cotton's attention; he remembered what vocabulary he would enjoy; and he was aware that certain allusions (which we have been unable to trace; i.e. to 'Don Diego' and 'Brokkenbury') would be appreciated. The only one of his own works mentioned by Nashe in the letter is *Christs Teares*, dedicated in 1594 to Lady Elizabeth Carey; and it is conceivable that a member of the Carey group would take pleasure in a reference to understand which it is necessary to know something of the 'seditious' nature of that pamphlet. (The passage runs: '... the players as if they had writ another Christs tears, ar piteously psecuted ...')

If the William Cotton to whom Nashe wrote *was* the man Smyth speaks of, the letter widens our knowledge of Nashe's position in 1596, if only in a few minor particulars. It shows, for instance, that he was now reduced

to making overtures to a man of rather lower social standing than some of his previous patrons, such as Sir George Carey or Henry Wriothesley. Moreover, the object of Nashe's solicitations this time is a man who is himself dependent on someone else. This may be only one of a number of letters sent to various people at different times. But it reveals a striking sensitivity towards current literary 'market' requirements, that of the drama being not the least interesting (Nashe says that although in 'there old Lords tyme' the players thought their 'state' settled, it is now so uncertain that they 'cannot build vpon it'). And the presence in the letter of what W. W. Greg has described as 'extravagantly cloacine comments' following the mention of Harington's *Metamorphosis* is probably due to a feeling of dismay or bitterness rather than to any particular delight in salacity for its own sake.

E. D. MACKERNES

#### JOHN TOLAND, FRANCE, HOLLAND, AND DR. WILLIAMS

In my article 'John Toland and the Age of Enlightenment',<sup>1</sup> *R.E.S.* xx (1944), 127, an anonymous letter was published (Bodl. Rawlinson MSS. D. 923, f. 317) which in the Rawlinson collection goes under this heading: 'Account of John Toland's Early Life to the Time of His Leaving Holland With a Special Reference to His Pretence of Being a Presbyterian.' This letter did not seem to call for comment. It gives a vivid and convincing account of the young Toland as he appeared to his contemporaries, and as he was, at least in essentials, in his exuberant youthfulness, his eccentricity, and his erratic nature.

This document gains in interest, because it can be confirmed, corrected, supplemented, and even identified by the help of a letter of 21 June 1694, written by Dr. Edmund Gibson, at that time Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, to the Reverend Dr. Charlett, Master of University College, Oxford, 1692-1722.<sup>2</sup>

Worthy Sir,

The account I had of the Irish Refugee is something improv'd since. When I told you he was all Irish, I was in an error. He was born in France, of an Irish father and French mother: brought up a Papist till ten or 12 years of age: came

<sup>1</sup> I am aware of the fact that it would have been more in accordance with convention to use the phrase 'Age of Reason', but I chose the unconventional term 'Age of Enlightenment' in order to underline the dynamic tendency of *Aufklärung*. It may not be without interest to note that the German term *Aufklärung* refers primarily to the activity of enlightening, whereas the English term *reason* and the French term *lumière* stress the result of this activity.

<sup>2</sup> Ballard Collection, Bodl. Libr. v. 27 (references are to old foliation).

to his friends in Ireland to see what could be had there, but finding nothing that answer'd expectation, came to Glasgow, where he was admitted *Alumnus Academicus*, as they call them; one that's maintained by the College. After he had play'd his pranks about the revolution, and made his speech at the head of the rabble (which by the by I am afraid will hardly be recover'd,) he mov'd to *Edinburrow*, and set up there for a *Rosacrucian*: gave them the nice name of *Sages*, and printed a Book in French and English, with this Title, *The Sage of the Time*. He had contriv'd that there should be some appearance of a flame in a closet next the Street, and no harm done. When all was safe and the House not burnt down or injur'd, as the Neighbours expected, his reputation grew upon it quickly, but whether under the name of Conjuror, or what other title, I know not. An acquaintance of his tells me, he has heard him express a very favourable opinion of Popery. The reason why he left Holland, was a quarrel he had with Monsieur *Spanheim*, upon which occasion he was hiss'd out of the school, and so the poor modest man had not the face to appear any more.

The handwriting of the two letters is that of the same person, who had evidently written the second letter to make up the *lacuna* of the first. The remark about Toland's French extraction is most exciting. Born in France! His mother French! His first book written in English and French! Admittedly the remark that he was born in France does not square with the tradition that he was born on 30 November 1670 in the peninsula of Inishowen, near Londonderry. But he was an illegitimate child, and probably neither the one story nor the other can be confirmed. And even if he was not born in France, this Irish-French origin would go far in explaining certain facts (like his Christian names *Janus Junius* which seem a most ingenious choice in the circumstances, or his occasional use of the French language). It would also account for his intellectual make-up, his critical faculty, his love of fame, and his extremism. This half-French origin would further explain the radical and revolutionary character of Toland's Deism, which is in contrast to the conservative character subsequently prevailing in English Deism,<sup>1</sup> but in agreement with the radicalism of the French Deists (like Voltaire and Diderot). This story can hardly be dismissed as a mere snatch of gossip, seeing that Dr. Gibson knew Toland. Only a little later, on 26 July 1694, he writes to the same correspondent: 'Mr. Toland was with me, and endeavour'd to clear himself from being an enemy to Camden.'<sup>2</sup> Moreover, other facts related by him prove to be correct. It is a fact that Toland studied under the younger Frederick Spanheim in Holland.

We can now fix the exact date of Toland's departure from Holland. On 19 August 1693 Benjamin Furly wrote the following letter from Rotterdam to John Locke, thereby introducing him to this philosopher:

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ernst Troeltsch, 'Der Deismus', in *Gesammelte Schriften*, iv. 441.

<sup>2</sup> Ballard Collection, v. 33.



I am heartily sorry for the delay in the book for my Ld Pembroke which could not be got into England by the packets by reason of the great strictness of the Captains who will take nothing: in so much that by the great Authority of Monsr Vandercoot the General Postmaster there, I could not get it passed that way; but received it back again yesterday and have given it to the bearer hereof Mr John Toland, who has a letter to you from Monsr. Le Clerc. I find him a freespirted ingenious man; that quitted the Papacy in James's time when all men of no principles were looking towards it; and having now cast off the yolk of Spiritual Authority, that great bugbear, and bane of ingenuity, he could never be persuaded to bow his neck to that yolk again, by whomsoever claymed; this has rendered it somewhat difficult to him, to find a way of subsistence in the world, and made him ask my counsell in the case. I told him I knew no way for him, but to find out some free ingenious English gentleman that might have occasion for a Tutor in his family, who would be as glad of the opportunity as himself; were my circumstances such, that I could entertain him, and he willing to abide with me, he should not be put to the trouble to seek further. But that being not so, I intreat you, Sir, to be assistant to him wherein you can; not for my sake, but for his own worth; he knows you to be the Author of that small book, by Mr. Le Clerc. For while I was telling Mr. Spademan, who brought him to me, that I had received such a book from England he said Mr. Le Clerc told him that it was yours.<sup>1</sup>

On 25 August 1693 Le Clerc informed Locke: 'Il est parti de Rotterdam, avec un vaisseau de guerre, il y a environ huit jours. Il se nomme Toland, et il demeure chez Madame Kerry, près de Lambeth, qui est parente ou alliée de Mr. L'Archevêque.' And on 11 September 1693 he again confirms the fact to Locke: 'Il partit sur un vaisseau de guerre qui accompagnoit la flotte marchande anglaise.'<sup>2</sup> Le Clerc gave him a book of his for 'My lord Privy Seal', and could not suppress his apprehension that Toland might sell the book ('Je lui ai fait assez d'amitiés, et m'il a paru assez honnête homme, pour croire qu'il aura vendu mon paquet; mais en tout cas, il sera facile, de s'en informer', to Locke, 25. 8. 1693).<sup>1</sup>

That Toland lived up to Dr. Gibson's first report may be gathered from a letter which reached Toland anonymously: 'The character you bear in Oxford is this; that you are a man of fine parts, great learning, and little religion.'<sup>2</sup> His Dutch friends, including Le Clerc, later arrived at a similar conclusion, as is confirmed by P. Coste's letter to Locke (23. 6. 1699):

Mr. Le Clerc travaille présentement à se justifier en Latin contre Mr. Cave et autres. Ce sera un volume de Lettres intitulé, *Epistolae criticae et theologicae*. Il y prouvera entre autres choses qu'il ne faut rien déguiser dans l'Histoire, même Ecclésiastique. Il est étrange que les Hommes ayent besoin qu'on leur prouve une chose si visible. Il fera voir que la dissimulation a fait grand tort au

<sup>1</sup> Lovelace Collection, Bodl. Libr.

<sup>2</sup> John Toland, *A Collection of Several of His Pieces* (London, 1726), ii. 295.



Christianisme. Il parlera de Mr. Toland sans le nommer. Ce Mr. Toland fait fort parler de lui en Hollande, comme d'un indiscret, sans pudeur et sans religion.<sup>1</sup>

The assumption that it was Dr. Williams who made a collection for Toland to maintain him for two years in Holland is now confirmed by Le Clerc's letter to Locke, Amsterdam, 11. 9. 1693: 'Il est non-conformiste, et fort de la connaissance de Mr. *Daniel Williams*, qui a fait le Gospel Truth.'<sup>2</sup>

All these points may seem rather trivial to the non-specialist. But this short note will have fulfilled its purpose if it succeeds in drawing attention to the fact that a modern biography of this neglected writer and a collection of some of his most important papers would be welcome.

If a further confirmation of the foregoing conclusions is wanted, it may be found in a letter by the same Dr. Gibson to the same Dr. Charlett of 13 June 1694, from which the anonymous undated Rawlinson letter is merely an extract and which adds to the account the following remarks:<sup>3</sup>

What you have at present is only the effect of a sudden recollection; I am encourag'd to expect several other particulars from second thoughts and a little enquiry. The person from whom I have it is a sober good man as far as I can apprehend at present; if I observe anything that shall make me suspect the contrary, you shall know it, that you may from thence take an estimate how far what he says may be rely'd upon. Reputation ought to be tenderly handl'd; but if a good number of such matters of fact could be clear'd by degrees, 't might possibly do the University a Service.

But I leave this whole matter to you to make what use of it and in what manner you please; and upon Orders, shall not fail to let you have whatever of this kind comes to hand. I am, Honor'd Sir,

Your most humble and most obl[iged] Servant]

As Dr. Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London (1720), was an enemy of the deists and freethinkers, against whom some of his pastorals were directed (1728-9), his accounts constitute an important contemporary source of information, if used with caution.<sup>3</sup>

F. H. HEINEMANN

<sup>1</sup> Lovelace Collection, Bodl. Libr. The book was published as *Johannis Clerici Epistolae Criticae et Ecclesiasticae, in quibus ostenditur usus Artis Criticae, cujus possunt haberi* (sic) *volumen tertium*. Amst., 1700.

<sup>2</sup> Ballard Collection, v. 26.

<sup>3</sup> My sincere thanks are due to the Keeper of Western Manuscripts, Bodleian Library, Oxford, for his permission to publish extracts from manuscripts, including some from the Lovelace Collection.

## REVIEWS

**Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight.** A Fourteenth-century Poem done into Modern English by KENNETH HARE. With an introduction, &c., by R. M. WILSON. Pp. 84. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948. 9s. net.

**Medieval English Verse and Prose in Modernized Versions.** By ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS and RUDOLPH WILLARD. Pp. xii+557. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1948. \$4.50.

It is not inappropriate that these two volumes should be surveyed together, one a modernizing of one of the greatest English poems of the fourteenth century, the other a series of sixty-two modern versions of English poetry and prose between the Norman Conquest and the Renaissance.

It is hardly possible in a review to enter into a long discussion of the art of translation; but it is necessary to postulate two important requirements—first, that the sense of the original should be carried over as accurately as possible into the new version, and second, that something of the 'flavour' of the original should be preserved.

Mr. R. M. Wilson, in a succinct, soberly factual introduction to Mr. Hare's volume, remarks that if a literal translation is desired prose is the only possible medium, but that most translators have turned *Sir Gawayne* into verse of one kind or another. It is, however, doubtful whether the Spenserian stanza is the most suitable verse-form; the necessity for rhyme has led Mr. Hare astray from the original, as in his

Aeneas then, a captain of the best,  
Loosed fluttering sails upon the water-way  
With his high kith, and sea-tossed won in quest  
New realms and golden islands scattered by the west,

which resembles only in general

Hit watȝ Ennias þe athel & his highe kynde  
Þat sipen depreced prouinces, & patrounes bicomē  
Welneȝe of al þe wele in þe west iles.

And at times the need for rhyme leads him to depart even farther, and to say of the Green Knight (a 'Fearsome Master')

Unblithe by twilight ere the cocks have crawn  
Were he to meet.

The long selection from *Sir Gawayne*, by Professor T. H. Banks, Jr., in the second volume, is much more of a literal translation, but attempts to reproduce the original metre. This is perhaps too heavy a burden for any translator to bear, and the result is at times a feeling of flatness; one wonders if the reader, whether student or lover of *belles-lettres*, will really be inspired by the modernization to wish to know the original. It is a curious fact, too, that the translator does not

utilize the revised edition of *Sir Gawayne* published by the E.E.T.S. in 1940 (nor is it mentioned in the Bibliography and Notes); had it been otherwise, there would surely have been different interpretations of, for example, ll. 59, 170.

The anthology as such does give an excellent conspectus of medieval English literature, beginning with *Lazamon*, *The Owl and the Nightingale*, and *The Ancren Riwele*, and proceeding by way of *Havelok*, Manning, Richard Rolle, *Piers Plowman*, and *The Pearl* to the Chaucerians, Caxton, and Malory. Proto-drama is represented and the lyric, and there is a selection from the Paston Letters. Scottish literature is illustrated by familiar passages from *The Brus* (the famous 'Freedom' lines singularly unimpressive in prose), *The Kingis Quair*, and *The Testament of Cresseid*.

A few final points. It is unfortunate that the 'blurb' to Mr. Hare's volume should state that *Sir Gawayne* 'was probably composed in 1360', 'in the idiom of North Lancashire', in view of Mr. Wilson's cautious statements on pp. 7-8 of the Introduction. In the anthology, a reference in the Preface (p. vii) to 'the Middle English of *Lazamon* or *Henryson*' is strange. The Bibliography and Notes are generally useful, but there are a few gaps; for instance, Gollancz's edition of *The Pearl* is omitted; Mackenzie's edition of *The Brus* is a selection only, and reference might have been made to the Scottish Text Society's edition, as also to Skeat's edition, in the same series, of *The Kingis Quair*: no mention is made of the editions of *The Testament of Cresseid* by H. H. Wood and Bruce Dickinson: and until this year at any rate the connexion of Henryson with Glasgow University had not been regarded as more than a possibility.

A. MACDONALD

**Love and War in the Middle English Romances.** By MARGARET ADLUM GIST. Pp. x+214. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1947; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$4.00; 22s. net.

The title of this book is somewhat deceptive. Here is no treatment of the Mars-and-Venus theme, but a bipartite book with War in a markedly subordinate position, though naturally the two topics converge from time to time. The authoress justifies her joint themes by pointing out that they are 'at the very core of medieval life', and it is true that our scrutiny of them in the Middle English romances, carefully compared with the social record, will tell us much about the realism of the Middle English romances as a whole—certainly far more than an examination of other medieval attitudes. It seems a task worth undertaking; and Dr. Gist's methods are sound. She has used ninety-five romances, interpreted their relevant passages sympathetically, and—especially on the theme of Love—illustrated from them an unsuspected wealth of emotional reactions and moral oddities. Rarely, this close reading is taken too far; and some of the unsavoury incidents are recorded with a ponderousness that sounds almost flippant. We are left, however, with a body of general conclusions emphatically justified by the evidence quoted: that the Middle English romances of Love are in the main realistic, but those of War far less so; that those poets who treat

of War do not move in a dream world, but simply exaggerate an ideal (even as the value of chivalry 'lay in the very soaring of its ideal above the plane of reality'); that even the authentic lovers are limited to one small, aristocratic class, on whose love-making *l'amour courtois* was largely a good influence (p. 105). Too much has hitherto been made of the 'modernity' of the Middle English romance; Dr. Gist, on the other hand, stresses the fixed ethical standards of the long era of romance-writing, and the lack of any chronological sense, any sense of a developing society, in the writers.

So the record of Love in the romances is accurate but, for the social historian, seriously limited in scope; it neglects the petty tragedies of the humble, and cannot comprehend the main strength of great love—it has no woman who went for advice to the 'wight in the broom', no fine wife of a Frisian sailor. Yet the record here is rich by comparison with other classes of literature, its details full of subtlety, its asides shrewd. The mere hero of the *chanson de geste*, with his cloying beauty, his overdrawn prowess, and his quite tiresome invulnerability, is a character whose fantastic triumph we would willingly exchange for the squirmings of the lovesick courtly hero; and even the latter, in his developed form, is rare in our romances. Above all, I feel that there is a striking contrast between the Middle English and (admittedly earlier) Anglo-Norman productions in this field, where we should expect resemblances, indebtedness, and like motives with a view to like audiences. Instead, we find the blunted outlines of the murderous Boeve, who loves his horse and his wife—and in that order: 'Ja est mun chival mort, ta mere mort la eyns' (*Boeve de Haumtone*, l. 3826); Amadas, remarking quite away from the courtly tradition that his lady may bestow her affections where she pleases once he has died for love; Horn, rather doggedly and dully loyal in his love, and abrupt in his love-making; Gui, positively hindered by love in his service to God. And, curiously, the love of the Anglo-Norman heroes and heroines is equated with a happy marriage (Thomas's *Tristan* is here, as in much else, an exception). It is as if the Anglo-Norman writers had imperfectly grasped the courtly technique, and created votaries of a love more practical and respectable.

The treatment of the War theme is more enjoyable than the first half of the book, which often has to resemble a medieval Sunday newspaper full of Alarming Experiences. Dr. Gist quotes and creates many good truisms on war and peace, and writes here with feeling and wit, while still continuing her scholarly compilation and her sensitive handling of material.

Despite the large number of quotations, misprints are surprisingly few, though on p. 150 *pes* (*peace*) occurs as *pes*, and *Llandaff* turns into *Llandoff*.

A. BASIL COTTLE

**Liriche religiose inglesi del secolo quattordicesimo**, tradotte da ALFREDO

OBERTELLO col testo a fronte. Pp. 287. Milan: Bompiani, 1948. 3,000 lire.

Dr. Obertello, formerly of University College, Cardiff, and known for his studies on early Italian music and its influence in England, has had the happy idea of making a representative selection from the English religious lyrics of the

fourteenth century and offering it to an Italian public with a translation, critical apparatus, and commentary. His long researches in British libraries, undertaken primarily in pursuit of evidence of the origin and dispersal of the Lullaby (or *ninna nanna*), had led him to contemplate a wider survey of the English religious and popular lyric from its origins in the tenth century down to the close of the medieval tradition in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and for this he had amassed a large quantity of material prior to the outbreak of war in 1939. What led him to confine the firstfruits of his research to the fourteenth century was (1) the conviction that this period occupied a central position in the evolution of the English religious lyric, and (2) the unfortunate loss of a portion of his manuscript during the war, which made it impossible to give adequate representation to the earlier and later centuries. Yet this has proved in many ways a fortunate restriction, since it has enabled him to set before the Italian reader a body of verse, entirely new to him, which both continues and contrasts with the tradition of his own thirteenth-century religious lyric, since both were branches, in Dr. Obertello's words, 'del glorioso albero della poesia medioevale latina affondata inestricabilmente a Roma con le sue radici, ma più particolarmente un glorioso germoglio della primavera francescana'.

Although all the poems in Dr. Obertello's collection are to be found in Carleton Brown's *Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century* (1924), his texts are derived in every case from the original manuscripts, collated afterwards with Brown's transcription, to which he acknowledges a substantial debt. He has been able, however, at various points to supplement the textual notes in this and other editions of the poems, and in the Glossary, where again, as also in the translations, he is naturally indebted to Brown, he has been able to make one or two useful corrections, the most important being in the meaning of *weye* in v. 19 of the rendering of *Vexilla Regis prodeunt* in Phillipps MS. 8336, given by Brown as 'way', where the sense is clearly 'balance':

beata, cuius brachiis  
pretium pendit saeculi!  
statera facta est corporis  
praedam tulitque tartari.

Another feature of the book is an admirable descriptive bibliography, incorporating some items unfamiliar to the English student.

Of the 58 pieces in the collection 16 are derived from Advocates' Lib. (now National Library of Scotland) MS. 18.7.21, so rich in lullabies and other exquisite things, and of this a page is reproduced in facsimile; 7 are from Camb. Univ. MS. Dd. 64. III, 6 from Phillipps MS. 8336, 3 from Harley MS. 2253, again with a facsimile, 2 from Rawl. poet. MS. 175, and the rest from a variety of sources, ending with *Quia amore langueo* from Douce MS. 322. Instead of the roughly chronological arrangement adopted by Brown, the poems are grouped according to theme: 'Hic mundus', 'Redemptio', 'Gloria, laus et honor', 'Ego, Christus', 'Domine Christe', and 'Mater Gratiae', though the chronological order is preserved as far as possible within the groups. This is undoubtedly the best system in a work intended for a general—and especially a Catholic—public, since it has the advantage of bringing together poems which often gain fresh

interest from their proximity, while emphasizing the leading topics of this whole body of verse.

It was suggested earlier in this review that perhaps the chief interest of Dr. Obertello's book was that it enabled one almost for the first time to compare the English religious lyric of the fourteenth century with that of the Italian Dugento, as it developed under the impulse of the Franciscan movement, and it is extraordinary how their family likeness is brought out in his translations. It is true that the spirit which inspired the worst excesses of the *flagellanti* finds little place in the English lyric, yet between many passages of the *laude* and the poems in such a collection as this there is often a close correspondence. In particular the mystic raptures of Jacopone da Todi and his identification with the sufferings of Christ do not seem strange when we come to them from the poems of Richard Rolle or such anonymous pieces as 'With scharpe thornes that weren ful kene' (Harley MS. 2253) or 'Loke to thi Loverd, man, thar hanget he a rode' (St. John's Coll. Camb. MS. 15), where, as Dr. Obertello says, 'non solo i concetti ma spesso i termini e l'intonazione coincidono, così che paiono d'una sola ispirazione e d'una sola voce'. But in general the tone of these poems reveals, as Dr. Obertello happily puts it, 'la frequenza e preferenza di quel ritegno o equilibrio, moderazione e insieme affabilità' which are characteristic of Middle English literature as a whole. These are qualities, too, which have never been lacking in Italian poetry from the first, and which might be summed up in the one word *gentilezza*. It is not perhaps strange then that the last echo of these fourteenth-century poems is to be heard in a writer who was of both English and Italian descent.

Love me brouthte,  
and love me wrouthte,  
man, to be thi fere.  
Love me fedde,  
and love me ledde,  
and love me lettet here.

(Advocates' Lib. MS. 18.7.21)

Is this not the very accent of Christina Rossetti?

JOHN PURVES

**The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More.** Edited by ELIZABETH FRANCES ROGERS. Pp. xxii+584. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. \$7.50; 42s. net.

This handsome complement of the very valuable 'Calendar of the Correspondence of Sir Thomas More' that Dr. Rogers published in 1922 (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*) appeared almost simultaneously with the volume (xi) of the *Erasmi Epistolae* (1947) which completes the correspondence of More's friend Erasmus; a coincidence that is marked by the striking and authoritative Foreword which Mrs. Allen has contributed to Dr. Rogers's book. This recent episode in the story of English humanism will perhaps best be appreciated by those who turn to Mrs. Allen's Preface to vol. viii (1934) and the *Compendium Vitae P. S. Allen*



written by her co-editor, Allen's friend H. W. Garrod, which precedes it. It is interesting, further, to be told of the active interest taken by P. S. Allen in Dr. Rogers's original 'Calendar' and to learn that it was he, indeed, who suggested it.

Except for some adjustments in dating and the introduction of fourteen new items, the Table of Contents of the *Correspondence* tallies with the 1922 'Calendar'. Eight of the fourteen, however, being patents or commissions, documents rather than letters, only the remaining six new items call for reference here. Five of these are unquestionably eligible for admission to the canon. Thus, No. 41A is the amusing but neglected letter to Peter Giles in the second or Paris edition of *Utopia* [Impendio me . . .]; No. 76 is More's charming verse-letter from the *Epigrammata* to his children, composed on horseback as he floundered in the rain through Flanders mud; No. 131, one of Gasquet's finds at the Vatican, is the letter in which Reginald Pole's tutor at Padua, Leonicus, asks More for a copy of his *Utopia*, which John Clement, then in Italy, duly delivered; No. 151 is a courteously veiled protest from Oxford to More, its High Steward; and No. 184 is from More's correspondent, the orthodox theologian Cochlaeus. The sixth new item, No. 193, is inadmissible. It purports to be from Erasmus to More, and is described in Dr. Rogers's *Table of Letters* as 'From Erasmus. Gratulor isti Reipublicæ . . . 12 October 1533'. We are told, however, by Mrs. Allen in her Foreword that 'Erasmus' letters to More after 1529 have perished'. Moreover, the item in question (193) is the letter referred to by P. S. Allen in vol. v, 617 n. (1924) as the only one extant from Erasmus to Desideratus Morellus, a Canon of Besançon. The letter itself is No. 2870 in Allen, vol. x (1941).

For the More-Erasmus letters—one quarter of the whole—Dr. Rogers provides no text, referring her readers to Allen; and this, though inconvenient, is preferable to lifting them out of their context in the *Erasmi Epistolae*. Detached from their web of cross-reference what might not befall them in other hands? Nevertheless, Dr. Rogers ought to have extended her references to Allen beyond vol. viii (1934). For items 183, 188, 191, and the peccant 193 references ought to have been given to Allen, ix. 2432, and x. 2659, 2831, and 2870. As things are the inquisitive reader is directed to the Erasmus *Aristotle* of 1531 for No. 183, the *De Praeparatione ad Mortem* of 1534, and to a seventeenth-century source. Two of these, More's last letters to his friend, are justly famous.

Next to the *Erasmi Epistolae* the chief repository is Stapleton's *Life of More in the Tres Thomae* (1588). We owe the preservation of these thirty-six items largely to Stapleton's co-exiles, John Harris, *secretarius intimus* of More for the last ten years of his life, and to his widow, Dorothy Colly, Margaret Roper's maid. Thus there are saved for us as a treasured family possession links with Colet, Tunstall, Warham, Bonvyse, Pole, Fisher, and above all Margaret, the children, the school, and the tutors. Stapleton dovetails admirably with Erasmus, taking over from him, as it were, after the visits of Erasmus to England had ceased in 1517.

Finally there are the consummate letters of the Trial and the Tower, which we owe to Margaret in chief and to the loyal and inflexible William Rastell, More's printer-nephew, Treasurer of Lincoln's Inn, editor of the *English Workes*, who

died in exile in Louvain while the 1565 edition of the Latin works was passing through the press. In conclusion, reference must be made to the Holbein illustrations and particularly the interesting portrait of Dame Alice from Lord Methuen's collection at Corsham Court; and also to Dr. Rogers's remarkably satisfactory dating. The reference to More's daughters 'disputing in philosophy afore the Kynges Grace' should I think be dated 1526 and not 1529 (*vide* Carver's edition of Palsgrave's *Acolastus*, p. xxxv). This adjustment has the interesting effect of making Palsgrave's reference contemporary with the Holbein sketch of the assembled More family.

A. W. REED

**Les Chansons Elizabéthaines.** By F. DELATTRE and C. CHEMIN. Pp. 459. (Bibliothèque des Langues Modernes II). Paris: Didier, 1948. 700 frs.

As a short anthology of the Elizabethan lyric this book could hardly be bettered. M. Delattre has chosen some one hundred and fifty poems, most of them familiar and lovely, and M. Chemin has translated them with becoming modesty into what he calls rhythmical prose. So far as an English reader can tell, his translations are discreet and accurate; sometimes they achieve an intensity entirely unexpected and perfectly parallel with the original.

Quand le veilleur de nuit frappe la cloche

is a mistranslation of

When the clapper hits the bell

in 'Maids to Bed and Cover Coal'; but that seems to be his only slip. It is most refreshing to see expressed with new force in another tongue lines which, for the native reader, are blurred with personal associations.

The anthology is well planned, with sections devoted to Ballads and Broad-sides, Miscellanies, Song-Books, Romances, and the Drama. M. Delattre's long introduction has a similar plan. In it he has written an extraordinarily thorough history of the Elizabethan lyric in all its important manifestations, gently insisting throughout upon his own theory of its development.

Very briefly, this theory is that the decline of the anthology and the end of the madrigal were alike caused by a shift of the social centre of poetry from the aristocracy, by the decay of aristocratic inhibitions about publication, and by the enlarging of the audience. The anthologies had been successful

parce qu'elles avaient constitué un moyen excellent de mettre à la disposition du public toute une production littéraire encore éparse. . . . Mais les poètes se sont mis, depuis quelque temps déjà, à publier leurs œuvres en volumes séparés. . . . Les lecteurs dont les rangs se sont élargis mais dont le goût en même temps est devenu plus exigeant, sont las désormais de toutes ces 'plaisantes délices' et 'inventions somptueuses'. . . . La musique polyphonique, la base même de la poésie pastorale, c'est-à-dire galante et lettrée, qui dominait dans les anthologies, a cessé de leur plaire, à cause de sa construction vocale compliquée qui aboutissait à une sorte de savante architecture sonore. Le madrigal notamment, avec sa conception impersonnelle de l'amour courtois qui n'est qu'un plaisir aristocratique, laisse la place à l'*air*, celui-ci inspiré directement de la fraîche et vigoureuse musique populaire, où le réalisme est maître. Et l'harmonie des voix et des motifs délicatement

enchevêtrés, des différents groupes de chanteurs s'opposant avant de se fondre, est abandonnée pour la mélodie toute simple qui ne doit plus rien aux modèles italiens, qui est proprement anglaise, où l'individualisme, même intense, deviendra bientôt l'élément essentiel. (Pp. 118-19.)

This is the thesis which determines the structure and choice of material in this uncommonly well-ordered book. It is certainly worth consideration, for it sets on a broader basis the whole problem of how the air came to replace the madrigal as the dominant form of the sung lyric. It is difficult, with Campion and Dowland in mind, to allow that the process could in any sense be one of vulgarization; and not much easier to assent to the proposition that there is something un-English about polyphony or something specially English about individualism—notions which perhaps have their origins in anachronistic assumptions concerning the 'land without music' and post-Elizabethan civil liberties. Nevertheless, M. Delattre's thesis does not depend entirely upon these assumptions, and a serious attempt of this kind to give shape and coherence to the staggeringly disparate material from which a history of Elizabethan song must be written is extremely valuable. Had this book been written in English it would have superseded many text-books, and offered to students, who may avoid it in its present form, a picture of Elizabethan poetry instantaneously attractive, organized, and intelligible.

What makes this particularly regrettable is the rich precision of M. Delattre's prose, so indicative of his scholarly and enthusiastic mind. It is delightful to find arguments and judgements, even when they are conventional, stated with such fresh vigour. Perhaps there are occasional flourishes which offend the austere taste of the modern Englishman; but, reading M. Delattre, one is in no doubt where, as between him and his Anglo-Saxon contemporaries, the quality of individualism is to be found.

FRANK KERMODE

**Shakespeare und der Tragödienstil seiner Zeit.** By LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING.  
Pp. 184. Bern: Francke, 1947. 7.50 Sw. fr.

The attempt to assess the true relationship between Shakespeare and other Elizabethan dramatists has been pursued in a somewhat desultory fashion since the time of Dryden, but it may be questioned whether the subject has ever been treated so thoroughly and systematically as in the present study by Professor Schücking. Not that his book is entirely satisfying. A subject so rich in the possibility (one might almost say, the necessity) of antithesis, distinction, and qualification would perhaps require for its full exploitation resources of style which Professor Schücking, in spite of his very considerable learning, insight, and common sense, can scarcely be said to possess. Moreover, those chapters more particularly devoted to an examination of the plays of Shakespeare's contemporaries are likely to be of more service to foreign than to English readers, consisting as they do largely of abstracts and descriptions. Nevertheless, in almost everything he has to say about Shakespeare himself and about the

resemblances and differences between him and his contemporaries, Professor Schücking is both sensible and illuminating, and it is difficult to suppose that even the most accomplished Shakespearian scholar could honestly declare that he had not learnt at least something from his book.

Professor Schücking's main conclusion, though reached by a different route and demonstrated by different arguments and illustrations, is not dissimilar from that on which Professor Stoll has so often and so usefully insisted: namely, that Shakespeare's plays, although they contain realistic or naturalistic elements, are essentially unrealistic, and that they differ from those of his contemporaries, not by being less 'fantastic' or spectacular or sensational, but by combining with these common characteristics an incomparably greater measure of dramatic and poetic power. Shakespeare, for example, unlike nearly all his contemporaries, saw that the mere appearance of a ghost upon the stage could not produce the effect of a real ghost, and that the thrill of horror which he (like them) wished to communicate could be communicated only in and through dramatic poetry. At the same time, with so much that is essentially unrealistic, exaggerated, or sensational Shakespeare, unlike his contemporaries, nearly always succeeds in combining something which critics from Dryden to Johnson agreed to call 'nature'. Compare, for example, Shakespeare and Ben Jonson at a moment when both are writing in the Senecan tradition. Just as the superhuman Atreus in Seneca's *Thyestes* is the prototype of Jonson's Catiline, Seneca's Medea is the prototype of Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth. This is especially obvious in her invocation of the powers of darkness, 'Come all you spirits and unsex me here', &c.

No woman ever spoke in this way. To speak thus of herself, in words which contain an annihilating condemnation of her own deed, is in accordance with the unrealistic, unpsychological style of antiquity.

But, while Jonson's Catiline begins and ends as a monster, Shakespeare does not forget that Lady Macbeth is a woman, not a demon, and later he restores her humanity and allows her violated feminine nature to have its revenge. Compare, too, the modesty and natural dignity of Othello or Henry V with the bombastic self-assertion, the furious vociferation, the scenical strutting of most other Elizabethan tragic heroes.

Professor Schücking often pauses to insist that we have become so familiar with Shakespeare's tragedies, have come to take them so much for granted, that we simply do not see any longer how 'sensational' they really are and how 'sensational' they first appeared. He omits to mention the lively recognition and condemnation of this element by Rymer and Voltaire, although he reminds us that even so uncompromising an opponent of the old-fashioned naturalistic and psychological interpretation as Professor Stoll has ventured to declare that Hamlet's struggle with Laertes in the grave is probably present in Shakespeare's play only because it appeared in Kyd's version and that it is a mere 'stage-effect', and he also reminds us that in an anonymous epitaph on Burbage it is precisely his performance of this scene that is singled out for special praise. Perhaps the chief value of such a comparative study is that, by compelling us to examine really

closely the elements out of which Shakespeare has made his plays, it may encourage us to pay less regard to 'characterization' and more regard to poetry—to that transmuting power which chiefly distinguishes Shakespeare from his contemporaries, that power which Mr. Shaw, on so many occasions, has grudgingly and exasperatedly recognized as something which has hypnotized us into admiring nonsense.

J. B. LEISHMAN

**Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure. Shakespeare's Early Plays on the Background of Renaissance Theories of Five-Act Structure from 1470.**

By T. W. BALDWIN. Pp. xviii+848. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1947. \$20.00.

It would be unwise to claim that a long tradition of Shakespearian scholarship has been overthrown in the twentieth century, but much of the learning of former ages has, at least, been rendered suspect. Recent successes in the fields of bibliography and Elizabethan stage conditions, and, more dubiously, imagery and character study, have shown the value of radical investigation in opening up completely new paths. The stages by which the Elizabethan professional drama came into being remain obscure and rather miraculous, for the preliminary period of progressive mediocrity is absent. Almost as soon as the demand arose, it was satisfied by the sovereign genius of Shakespeare and Marlowe. Greene, Kyd, Porter, and Nashe, though slighter artists, are scarcely less remarkable when viewed as isolated phenomena.

At the root of Professor T. W. Baldwin's investigations lie the more precise attributes of the Renaissance, and his purpose is to illumine the relations between classical drama, with its inevitable entourage of Renaissance hermeneutics, and Elizabethan. Accepting the tradition that Shakespeare attended Stratford Grammar School, Baldwin scrutinizes the normal curriculum of the Elizabethan grammar schools and shows that Shakespeare must have received rather more Latin, if less Greek, than Jonson has led us to suppose. Since the dramatist, Terence, loomed large in the curriculum, it is reasonable to suppose that Shakespeare, at the outset, saw in Terence's comedies a pattern for play-making, and that his native wood-notes wild were framed to a Terentian pattern. Baldwin's standpoint, then, is that Shakespeare derived his five-act structure from the plays that he read at school, especially the *Andria*, with additional stimulus from the Terentian practices of John Lyly.

In support of this thesis Baldwin considers in great detail the various Renaissance attempts to evolve an ideal structure for tragedy and comedy from the theories of play structure formulated by Aristotle and Horace, but more particularly from Terence's practice and its resultant elaboration into doctrine at the hands of Donatus and Servius. He shows that the Renaissance was mainly dependent on Donatus, who had imposed the Greek three-part functional division of drama on Terence's five-part anatomical analysis. From the mass of commentators who rang the changes on these early theories, Baldwin isolates Ioducus Willichius as the apostle of structural integration and one of the most significant



Renaissance figures: 'He faces the problem of play structure from the point of view of the person who is attempting to write a play, his assumption being that the play must be written exactly on the model of the old plays, if it is to be correct. The model of structure he derives from a synthesis of all the learning upon structure.'

It was by this Willichius synthesis that Shakespeare's notions of five-act structure were finally determined. The laborious evidence which leads Baldwin to this conclusion does not seem, in all its details, to hold very great interest for Shakespeareans, and I, for one, do not feel competent either to plead for its acceptance or to press for its rejection. It must suffice that this thesis leads a penetrating and well-equipped scholar on to an independent scrutiny of Shakespeare's early plays, a scrutiny, moreover, in which the author is content, at times, to wander away from his main path and permit himself ample explorations.

The matter of these chapters on Shakespeare is so unfamiliar that it will be convenient to summarize the main points that Baldwin makes about each play. *Love's Labour's Lost* is based on a fusion of Lyly's *Galathea* and *Endimion* and we need look for no other source. It was written in 1588 and was augmented just prior to printing in 1598. The later augmentation served chiefly to develop the character of Holofernes who had been relatively insignificant in the original version. For *The Comedy of Errors*, written in the last quarter of 1589, Shakespeare used Lambinus's edition of the *Menaechmi* together with the *Amphitruo*, but marshalled Plautus to a biblical pattern by incorporating matter from Saint Paul's last missionary journey. The dramatic structure of the play is determined, however, by Willichius's five-act analysis of the *Andria*. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, which Baldwin dates before 1592, 'shapes its general structure to that of *The Comedy* but takes its epithetical machinery from the source of *Romeo and Juliet*, which was about to be written'. It shows that Shakespeare had not yet freed himself from the tyranny of formal endings and invites comparison with *All's Well that Ends Well* which preceded it. *Romeo and Juliet*, which followed close on *The Two Gentlemen*, was written not later than the second half of 1591. It is closely allied, through Brooke, with *The Two Gentlemen* and again follows the *Andria* formula, so that its main action is delayed until the third act. Throughout this period, 'it is the unlearned Shakespeare, "with neither Latin nor Greek", who is giving form to romantic narrative by learning to put it into the Terentian expository machinery'.

It will probably be some little time before scholars decide how many of Baldwin's conclusions they can justly accept, for his field is an immense one and even the present massive volume claims to be no more than a part of work in progress. Professor Baldwin is a voluminous writer and we must, in fairness, hear him to the end. It must stand, then, as a purely provisional judgement if I say that I mistrust much of his evidence for the chronology of Shakespeare's early plays. The external testimony that he brings forward seems tenuous, and too much is made of coincidental allusion. Moreover, the notion that structure is a reliable guide to chronology seems to me to be just another 'scientific' criterion, though it must be conceded that Baldwin presents his case most ably. The truth is that we cannot assert that such-and-such was Shakespeare's method



at any given period. His variety confounds all our assurance; and it cannot be too often repeated that every play that had the full weight of Shakespeare's artistic conscience behind it presented him with a new set of problems which he was sometimes content to solve in an old way. Baldwin, in support of his points about the *Two Gentlemen-Romeo and Juliet* relationship, cites a close parallel with Brooke in Proteus's lines:

Even as one heat another heat expels,  
Or as one nail by strength drives out another,  
So the remembrance of my former love  
Is by a newer object quite forgotten.

This, surely, is slender evidence for dating, or are we to conclude, since Tullus Aufidius proclaims,

One fire drives out one fire; one nail, one nail;  
Rights by rights falter, strengths by strengths do fail

that *Coriolanus*, too, belongs to the early fifteen-nineties?

Even if we grant that Shakespeare, in his earlier plays, was highly dependent on Terentian form, there remain details in Baldwin's picture of the young dramatist that are not wholly convincing, notably the assumption that Shakespeare began as a writer of romantic comedy. It is, surely, over-subtle to draw such a conclusion from the 'facetious grace' that Chettle conceded to Shakespeare, and even more hazardous to derive support from Greene's famous attack: 'Greene had been jealous of his success in the romantic vein, and Shakespeare was not the first to be accused by him of infringing on patent rights.' On the whole, it is more plausible to argue that Greene was jealous of Shakespeare's success in the historical vein, mainly because he was a member of a history-play syndicate from which Greene was excluded. The terms of Greene's attack ('to bombast out a blanke verse', 'an absolute *Iohannes fac totum*', and the parody of a line from *Henry the Sixth*) suggest anything but romantic comedy.

One or two points of detail call for comment. On p. 99 Baldwin's reference to the Folio texts of *The Two Gentlemen* and *The Merry Wives* shows that he is, apparently, unaware of the current view that their peculiarities are due to the scribal habits of Ralph Crane. It is not strictly accurate to designate Professors Quiller-Couch and Dover Wilson 'the Cambridge editors' (p. 601 and *passim*). The spelling 'Shakspere' may be justified by American usage, but it seems merely perverse to transform 'Condell' into 'Cundall'. In the index Richard Farmer and J. S. Farmer are given indiscriminately under 'Farmer, R.'

It must be conceded that Professor Baldwin's book is important both as a contribution and as a challenge. If, however, it fails to attract students of Shakespeare, Baldwin has only himself to blame, for the exposition of detail is carried out in these pages with a positively Teutonic thoroughness and no line is drawn between the significant and the merely interesting. To devote ten pages to the date of *Roister-Doister* in a book about Shakespeare's five-act structure argues a defective sense of relevance and proportion. But then, it is not until p. 544 that we begin to come to Shakespeare.

J. M. NOSWORTHY

**John Milton at St. Paul's School. A Study of Ancient Rhetoric in English Renaissance Education.** By DONALD LEMEN CLARK. Pp. xi+269. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$3.50; 20s. net.

Professor Clark is well equipped for such an investigation as this, having already written a work on *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance* (1922) and another, not yet published, on *The Teaching of Rhetoric in Greece and Rome*. He has also edited Milton's *Prolusions* for the Columbia edition. The expectations thus aroused of faithful and scholarly procedure, entailing the clear distinction of conjecture from fact, are fulfilled in the present volume. Uncertainty remains on many points concerning Milton's schooldays, even when they began and therefore how many years they covered; but the arguments about this and other problems always appear to be controlled and reliable.

In the initial chapter there is a discussion of the trivium, the comprehensive course in grammar, rhetoric, and logic, provided at St. Paul's, and Professor Clark shows how closely Milton's training, chiefly in Latin, resembled that of a Roman boy of the first century, chiefly in Greek. In the next two chapters there is a full account, based in part on Milton's own reminiscences, of his life at St. Paul's—a vital focus of Christian humanism, where not only 'Christian authors' were to be taught but also all such Greek and Latin writers as 'hathe with wisdom joyned the pure chaste eloquence' of the Augustan age. A chapter is given to Milton's schoolmasters, especially the two most eminent among them, Alexander Gil, senior and junior, whose careers as men of letters are set forth in all ascertained detail, with the ways in which they may be supposed to have influenced Milton's thought and interests. The remainder of the volume, more than half of it, is occupied by a careful description of his actual studies, so far as they are known or can safely be surmised: what text-books he may have used, what authors would be recommended for 'imitation', what exercises for 'praxis'. One quotation will serve to illustrate Professor Clark's speculative thoroughness: 'The Lambinus edition of Horace was in the library of St. Paul's School. May Milton have used this edition, or did he use Bond's? Only a painstaking and protracted study could hope to find an answer.'

Some of the school methods left their traces on Milton's later works: 'L'Allegro' and 'Il Penseroso' represent the topics of 'encomium' and 'vituperation'; all the *Prolusions* are in the nature of school 'theses'. No doubt it is possible to exaggerate the relations between Milton's school-exercises and his later writings. When Milton in the *First Defence* criticizes Salmasius for his manner of quoting Aeschylus, and says 'we must not regard the poet's words as his own, but consider who it is that speaks in the play', Professor Clark sees evidence that Milton was familiar with the exercise of Impersonation or 'Prosopopoeia', whereas he may simply have been thinking for himself or recalling Aristotle's *Poetics*, 25 (1461<sup>a</sup>). It is also suggested, rather gratuitously, that the same exercise accounts in some measure for the excellence of the speeches in *Comus*, *Paradise Lost*, &c. On the other hand, in observing that 'Ecphrasis' or set-piece description is exemplified for modern readers by 'Pater's Mona Lisa and

Ruskin's *St. Mark's*, Professor Clark misses the opportunity of referring to the extended formal descriptions in Milton's epics.

When all is said there are not many very firm connexions to be made between Milton the schoolboy conning his lessons at St. Paul's and Milton the mature genius writing *Paradise Lost*; and it is one of the signal merits of Professor Clark's book that not too much is made of the information it offers. If we want to know what sort of intellectual porridge was put before the genius in its tender years we can safely trust this book to tell us. Professor Clark has done Milton scholars a real service; and deserves all honour for the patience and discretion with which he has conducted his inquiry.

L. C. MARTIN

**Men of Letters and the English Public in the Eighteenth Century, 1660-1744, Dryden, Addison, Pope.** By ALEXANDRE BELJAME. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by BONAMY DOBRÉE. Translated by E. O. LORIMER. Pp. xxiv+492. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1948. 25s. net.

An English translation of Beljame is welcome: it is a first-rate book of its kind; the French edition is scarce; and it needed editing, because it might otherwise mislead those not familiar with the period. Beljame was one of the earliest French scholars whose studies of English authors have made such notable additions to our knowledge. He was the precursor of Huchon, Émile and Pierre Legouis, and Cazamian.

Our views have of course altered since Beljame first published his volume in 1881. Had he written as a critic it may be that a new edition would not have been worth producing. But his chief object was to show the altering conditions under which writers published their works during the period his book covers. No writer can be entirely independent of financial considerations and to some degree what he writes will be affected by them. Beljame's thesis is, in the main, based on facts, or what he believed to be facts. His story is true in its broad outline, although it needs constant modification in detail. Professor Dobrée in his introduction and notes has attempted to bring Beljame's views into proper perspective. He has succeeded, and if some faults are to be found it could not reasonably be asked that he should annotate everything Beljame wrote. The book is too well known to need description here. Beljame traces the position of authors who were dominated by the court of Charles II or some nobleman, until they became dependent on, or co-operated with, a publisher, notably Jacob Tonson or Lintot. The whole process is drawn too much in black and white; but Beljame had a remarkable knowledge of the Restoration, and of the first half of the eighteenth century, and if he was sometimes wrong he was never slipshod. He accepts too readily, as Professor Dobrée points out, satirical pieces as evidence of actual happenings; he is rather over-concerned with the moral aspect of literature and so is inclined to make too great a contrast between the wickedness of Dryden and the virtue of Addison. He quite underestimates Rochester as a poet and overestimates Jeremy Collier's vigorous diatribes as a

reforming influence. He makes too much of the changes in political power as an influence for good or ill on the fortune of writers, for as Professor Dobrée says, most authors, except popular novelists, have had some independent means, and could hardly have written at all if either patrons or publishers were their sole sources of income. The translation by Mrs. Lorimer is admirable, and the book is eminently readable in its English version from beginning to end. It must be added that the student should pay attention to the notes because Beljame often explains his meaning precisely in them when he has been content to generalize in the text. Beljame's bibliography is an integral part of the book, as it shows that he was aware of writers whom he hardly otherwise mentions. It has been brought up to date to a reasonable extent, but so many books on the Restoration and the eighteenth century have been published since Beljame's death that it cannot be regarded as a full guide.

It remains only to point out that Professor Dobrée could usefully have added to his notes. For instance, more information about Samuel Butler's money affairs has been made available by E. S. de Beer since the *D.N.B.*, which Professor Dobrée quotes, was published; it is doubtful if Rochester had anything to do with the attack on Dryden in Rose-Alley. As *MacFlecknoe* was written at least as early as 1679 it could not have been an answer to Shadwell's *The Medal of John Bayes* (1682). The letter (quoted on p. 26) from the *Gentleman's Magazine*, February 1745, is almost certainly a compilation from printed sources, and not an old man's recollections. But these are small matters and even if one adds to them the reader is as safe as he need be under Professor Dobrée's guidance. There are a few misprints, which might well be corrected in another edition.

HUGH MACDONALD

**Jonathan Swift: Journal to Stella.** Edited by HAROLD WILLIAMS. Vol. i, pp. lxii+368; vol. ii, pp. 369-801. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. 42s. net.

The re-editing of Swift's verse and prose has, for the last thirty years, been proceeding at such a pace, and along such all-embracing lines, that it may now be regarded both as rapidly nearing completion, and as achieving, in almost every sector attempted, a degree of exhaustiveness unknown in preceding editions. Swift, in that respect, has been one of the most privileged of the greatest English writers, and the more so as his writings bristle with editorial difficulties as complex as any in the whole range of English literature, not excluding the works of Shakespeare himself. It is well known that Swift often seemed to conspire with chance, or ill luck, and hostile, or clumsily well-meant, machinations, to confuse the public about the authorship of his own works, even to the point of practising this humorous or sarcastic sport as a hoax upon himself. That these difficulties have almost all been overcome within such close limits of time is a credit to the patience, fervour, and discrimination of modern scholarship. After Dr. Ball's monumental edition of Swift's *Correspondence* (1910-14) and the enriched editions of 'individual' correspondences revised from manuscript, e.g. A. M. Freeman's *Vanessa*, 1921, and Professor Nichol Smith's remarkable

*Letters of Swift to Ford*, 1935 (which included large batches of unknown letters), we had new editions of some of the most prominent prose works provided with scholarly introductions and careful historical notes. In 1920 Guthkelch and Nichol Smith's *Tale of a Tub* was published. In 1935 Davis's *Drapier's Letters* made this work really accessible for the first time. Then, to crown the whole, came the notable achievement represented by the three 8° volumes of *Poems* in which Mr. Harold Williams sifts, as definitely as seems possible, the authentic verse of Swift from the spurious, and probes into many related biographical problems which had hitherto been neglected or incompletely solved.

All this had to be briefly recalled for a full comprehension of this new publication by the same author and editor. For the *Journal to Stella* is, of all the writings of Swift, the most intimate in character, the most 'esoteric' in delivery and presentation, the most ill-treated by fate as regards loss of manuscript, the most diversely interpreted, and, therefore, the most misunderstood. It is well that it should be offered to us anew to-day by one whose general competence in Swiftian editorship is acknowledged by all as unsurpassed, and whose particular knowledge of the *Journal* is supreme. Under his guidance we may feel assured that we are henceforth emerging from the period of erratic or fanciful interpretations and reaching definite positions for a sound historical appraisal of these privileged and unfortunate letters.

The misfortune was the loss (at present irretrieved, and perhaps irretrievable) of the thirty-nine manuscript letters forming the batch found by Mrs. Whiteway after Swift's death, and published by Deane Swift in 1768. The twenty-five manuscript letters now preserved in the British Museum correspond to the letters previously published by Hawkesworth in 1766. Sheridan, in 1784, published both series, but very carelessly and without taking advantage of the critical work done by Nichols for his 1779 *Supplement* to Swift's Works, where he had first used the title of 'Journal to Stella'—of which he was the originator. Nichols's new edition of the *Works* in 1801 'showed a real advance' as regards accuracy of text, and was the basis of Sir Walter Scott's edition of 1814. But the conventionalization of the spelling, the writing in full of Swift's abbreviations, went on even after Forster's first efforts to study the 'script' in the Appendix to his *Life of Swift* (1875) in such modern editions as Ryland's (1897) and Aitken's (1901). It is only with Moorhead (1924) that the collation of the text with the British Museum manuscripts was seriously attempted and helpful corrections were made. There the matter rested, as far as editing was concerned. The 'little language', looked upon with a slight curl of the lip by Hawkesworth and his followers, including Aitken, was little scrutinized until Forster and Moorhead set about it, the former as a sort of learned amusement, the latter with an earnest awakening of historical curiosity. Moorhead's painstaking, penetrating, often ingenious readings have demonstrated effectively that a complete unravelment of the script and erasures is necessary for the understanding of the *Journal*.

Mr. Williams's approach to the subject has been impartial, and is essentially based on historical method. His starting-point in this work, as in his previous Essay 'Deane Swift, Hawkesworth and the Journal to Stella',<sup>1</sup> has been the

<sup>1</sup> In *Essays on the Eighteenth Century presented to David Nichol Smith* (Oxford, 1945).



comparison of Deane Swift and Hawkesworth as editors of the *Journal*, which leads him to give his decided preference to Deane Swift, both in point of textual correctness and as regards critical insight into the thought and temperament of Swift, and the exact nature of Swift's and Stella's relations. Like Deane Swift, but in a new and fuller measure, he lays emphasis on the depth of the affection between Swift and Stella, an affection which lasted as long as their lives, and prevailed in both of them over every other feeling, even in the midst of the Vanessa episode.

In stressing this point Mr. Williams definitely breaks with a tradition. Swift's biographers had long tended to minimize the intimate, fully human aspect of the *Journal to Stella* and to present instead a consistent and diligent 'journal' of daily events and prominent people, with a predominantly documentary interest. This latter conception had, in fact, been initially countenanced by Hawkesworth's 'polished', or pruned presentation. By reverting to the inner purport of the *Journal* Mr. Williams is at one with the more 'modern' interpretation (already upheld by such literary critics as George Saintsbury or Virginia Woolf), but his analysis of Swift's feelings is careful and guarded. He excludes 'passing emotions' and 'violent impulses', and dwells on the calmer, more homely, and soothing character of this deep-lying affection. 'In the little language of his journal Swift found happiness and refreshment of spirit as he turned from the business and vexations of the day' (p. lx). Yet this 'happy' feeling 'delighted in the use of the alphabetical symbols and fond tokens' so 'natural' and so 'frequent between lovers' (p. lv). The word is spoken: the little language is a language of lovers. The thought of marriage, likewise, is not excluded either from Esther Johnson's solitary longings or from Swift's preoccupations, notably during and after the curious Tisdall episode. It is, after all, the only possible conclusion, reached by all who intently ponder this obsessing problem.

But Mr. Williams stops there and wisely forbears from reading beyond the symbols. His rejection of one of the hypothetical 'superstructures' (as he rightly puts it) of the present reviewer's study, published some years ago on the little language, is in this respect characteristic. We readily surrender to him the attempt to trace back the recurring word 'rife' ('mine deeleast rife M D . . .') to a risky literal decipherment. Neither is the identity of words necessary to the full divination of such intimate, less than half-spoken, utterances. 'Suggestion' itself would be a misleading term for keys to this implicative language. Mere consonance in whispered syllables is enough to restore the chain of the acceptances of the heart. The little language is steeped in the warm confidence of ideal familiarity. These secret dialogues surrounding the cheerful chats and town gossipings spring from a twofold source, which might be described as the avoidance of the explicit, combined with unmistakable, and unmistakable, symbols. But the symbols are necessary; they were the surest signs for recognition, and are of many kinds: full words, loose or lopped-off syllables, capitals, dashes, scrawls, volutes, all sorts of scorings and erasures, for we have now, printed in full, and faithfully reproduced in this edition, the irrefutable statements of Swift, when he smudges a word or scratches off another, or blots a whole sentence, in order to stress or soften the sound or the meaning, or simply to notify that he wishes to

gain  
M  
smu  
uses  
let  
of t  
T  
—in  
the  
stria  
obje  
refer  
inte  
he p  
simi  
conf  
liter  
we  
Brit  
reve  
B  
the  
non  
a re  
and  
aned  
unc  
thes  
of th  
of kn  
they  
on n

Eliz  
Pp  
U  
bo  
It  
Lam



gainsay, or qualify, or playfully to prevaricate, 'That Blot is a Blundr, nite dee M D'.<sup>1</sup> 'Fais I dont conceal a bit, as hope savd',<sup>2</sup> or, apologetically, after a smudge 'I dont care to write that word plain'.<sup>3</sup> 'Blot', 'conceal' are the words he uses for even scrawls that do not blot out, or concealments that, more than once, let the words through. The whole process is meant as a complementary device of the language, and is part and parcel of it.

This has been denied by a recent critic,<sup>4</sup> which denial logically—and drastically—involves the formal disavowal of Swift's hand in the writing of the script, and the *Journal* itself, an inference running counter to sense. Mr. Williams, who strictly refrains in his Introduction from taking sides in the debate, yet so objectively and luminously expounds the case, quoting Swift's words with exact reference to the obliterated passages, that he leaves no room for refutation. His integration of the facts (ii. 519, 529, 605), together with the personal explanations he gives (particularly ii. 519), shows that he ascribes the same meaning, or a similar value, to the scored-out lines or phrases, and thereby, we are positive, confers definite authority on the 'theory', which, in fact, is nothing else than the literal acceptance of Swift's pronouncements made in his own hand. For this we are wholly indebted to the twenty-five preserved manuscript letters of the British Museum. One may ask oneself, with unbounded regret, what further revelations the lost manuscripts might have afforded on this crucial point.

But crucial as it is, it is but one of the numberless historical problems besetting the editor of this most difficult of all Swiftian writings. Mr. Williams has shunned none of these difficulties, both as to the identification of all the personages—a real pageant of the society of the day—mentioned in those sixty-five letters, and the elucidation of all allusions to political events, incidents of social life, or anecdotal trifles and manifold happenings of those busy, lively days. The unceasing and sumptuous accompaniment of notes from beginning to end of these two volumes, the seven Appendices completing vol. ii, and the sixty pages of the very dense and surprisingly 'new' Introduction, constitute a real treasure of knowledge on Swift's mind and life. With the three volumes of the 'Poems', they make up an incomparable Swiftian Encyclopedia, throwing floods of light on nearly half of one of the greatest centuries of English letters.

ÉMILE PONS

**Elizabethan Poetry in the Eighteenth Century.** By EARL R. WASSERMAN. Pp. 291 (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. xxxii, Nos. 2-3). Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1947. \$1.50 paper bound; \$2.50 cloth bound.

It was originally suggested to the author of this book that he should investigate Lamb's share in reviving Elizabethan literature. From this *point de départ* he

<sup>1</sup> 10 Jan. 1712-13.

<sup>2</sup> 8 April 1712.

<sup>3</sup> 16 March 1711-12.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Irvin Ehrenpreis, *S.P.* xlv (1948), pp. 80-8.

found himself travelling back into the eighteenth century and there digging down to uncover the cables by which the Elizabethan tradition had been transmitted.

First, the neo-classic canons of art are exhibited (more fully perhaps than is necessary for such a well-explored subject) and the age's distaste for the Elizabethans is established from a variety of sources. More novel is the ensuing demonstration of the licence with which editors tampered with Elizabethan verse. The methods they used are demonstrably akin to those they employed in translating the classics; it is not so certain that their intention was the same. Agreed that they felt themselves superior to the Elizabethans and carried out their 'improvements' in a spirit of condescension; towards the classics they behaved with the deference due to rank and in adapting them were seeking to add distinction to their own age. In discussing Percy's interest in Elizabethan lyric, Wasserman takes a look behind the monumental *Reliques* and discovers that many of the lyrics included in it were already well known earlier in the century. Percy was not, of course, rediscovering the Elizabethan lyric. It had never been lost. His distinction is rather that he sought to give accurate texts of the poems and to rally the attention of scholarship to them. He obviously thought highly of them. One might point out that in adopting Shenstone's suggestion to include them with the ballads, he was not simply, as Wasserman supposes, recognizing a similarity of freshness and spontaneity in the two forms. These 'little elegant pieces of the lyric kind', as he called them, were intended to dilute the acidity of the ballads for eighteenth-century palates.

It was Spenser, however, who of all the Elizabethan poets, and of course in a much less degree than Milton, attracted attention in the eighteenth century. Wasserman carefully analyses the reasons for this and makes a minute examination of the history of Spenserian imitation. To this end the bones of many a buried poetaster are beaten and the dust raised from the files of eighteenth-century periodicals. When it settles, we perceive what we already knew: the *Faerie Queene*, though constantly read, and even admired as well as imitated by writers, significantly failed to inspire any great and original creative writing, and it was not until late in the century that Spenser's obvious imaginative genius began to take effect. The last, and best, section of the book is devoted to the Elizabethan revival at that time. The thesis, which we may accept as proven, is that the revival was, more accurately, an intensification of a persistent interest, made possible by the rise of the historical method in criticism. Thomas Warton and the continuing influence of Bentley's editorial methods are shown to have been essential to it.

Where so much matter has been uncovered one hesitates to ask for more. Nevertheless, it must be noted that there is no reference to Johnson's Dictionary, to the part played by libraries (after all the British Museum was founded in the middle of the century), or to the availability of original Elizabethan editions, many of which it must still have been possible to consult and even, as Malone's collection proves, to purchase quite cheaply. To revert to the first point, Johnson's Dictionary provided a snippet anthology of Elizabethan verse and was also an instrument for establishing kinship between Elizabethan and

contemporary vocabulary, the estrangement between which, as Wasserman himself shows, was a major hindrance to the appreciation of the Elizabethans.

In this, the first of two projected studies, the author has, aesthetically speaking, the less exciting task. As he toils through the lowlands of eighteenth-century verse one is constantly aware that his delectable mountain lies just beyond the limits of his present journey. If as a result the book is duller and less instructive than its successor should be, it nevertheless contains a mass of documentary material on the fortunes of Elizabethan verse and is a useful contribution to the history of English studies. The style, never escaping far from the dominion of the card index, is neither elegant nor lively; at times, in its use of 'goodly share', 'end product', 'totality', 'dictional borrowings' and the like, it is almost unpleasant.

COLIN J. HORNE

**The Intonation of American English.** By KENNETH L. PIKE. Pp. xi+200. (University of Michigan Publications: Linguistics: vol. 1.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1946. \$2.00.

Henry Sweet once confessed that he did not think he had either the training or the aptitude to work on intonation, and there is no doubt that research in this branch of phonetics is intricate and exacting. Few later phoneticians have been so frank, but few have ventured to involve themselves deeply in it, and only half a dozen in England have made major contributions. Even less has come from America, but Dr. Pike, whose earlier *Phonetics* (Ann Arbor, 1943) revealed him to be a phonetician with a refreshingly original and provocative outlook, has now launched an ambitious attack on this thorny subject. In spite of the 'American' in the title, it should prove of the greatest interest to students of English of all types.

Dr. Pike holds intonation to be a *contrastive* feature of English speech. Unlike, for example, voice quality, which exhibits merely *gradient* differences, it is organized into a system of a limited number of types between which there is opposition. It is, therefore, susceptible of the same kind of analytic approach as that which produces 'phonemes' from the continuum of speech sounds. Just as meaningful words are composed of meaningless phonemes, so intonation has meaningful 'contours' (or tunes) composed of meaningless sub-units. In American English, these sub-units turn out to be *four* (relative, of course) *pitch levels*, at which the tunes begin, end, or change the direction of the glide. They are the 'basic building blocks' of the tunes. Less than four would fail to account for all the phenomena; more would give tunes which do not 'contrast'.

This is a surprising analysis, for it puts English on the same descriptive level as many tone languages, and its discovery surprised Dr. Pike himself. Nevertheless, a convincing and amply illustrated case is made out. The four pitch levels, moreover, provide several convenient possibilities of notation, which are demonstrated in connected texts. In dealing with the 'meaning' of the tunes, Dr. Pike abandons any attempt to give them grammatical or lexical definitions, and defines them instead in terms of attitudes of the speaker. He carefully considers also an almost entirely neglected point—the relation of intonation to pause, rhythm,

voice quality, and length. The book contains a most useful historical introduction (from which the work of A. M. Bell is an unaccountable omission) and a valuable bibliography (in which Hans Krause's *Intonation und Lautgebung* might have been included).

It remains to be seen whether the system of four pitch levels applies to British English, and if so, whether it provides the best basis for description and notation. It seems at least possible that it does. But even those who will not agree that 'prosodic' features such as intonation can profitably be handled in this 'phonemic' way cannot fail to be stimulated by this thorough and challenging presentation of Dr. Pike's researches.

DAVID ABERCROMBIE

**Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Vol. XX, 1939.**

Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by ANGUS MACDONALD and LESLIE N. BROUGHTON. Pp. xii+292. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. 18s. net.

All students of English will welcome the reappearance of the *Annual Bibliography*. But to most of them 1939 will seem a very long time ago, and they may for that reason be able to read this volume in a way that would not normally be possible with a bibliography. They will be reminded, as they turn its pages, not only of the remoteness of 1939, but also that this was a great year for the study of English. The Sutton Hoo finds were made in 1939; in that year *The Place-Names of Wiltshire* by Gover, Mawer, and Stenton (416), and Sir William Craigie's *Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles* (744) were added to the equipment of students of language. Carleton Brown's *Religious Lyrics of the Fifteenth Century* (1932), the first and second volumes of Herbert Davis's edition of *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift* (3433 and 3434), and the second and fourth volumes of *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope* (3367) were published. The publication of such works in 1939 was an act of faith.

Another act of faith was made that year in R. W. Chambers's *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (1444). It is sad to reflect that this was his last book, and that in 1939 his friend and colleague Sir Allen Mawer also published his last considerable work (416 above). A sobering reflection of a different sort is the thought that 1939 was the last year in which German scholarship made its peculiar contribution to the study of English, and that already its quality was in decline. Nevertheless, the name of Holthausen does still figure three times in the *Bibliography*, and the appearance of another portion, probably the last, of Luick's great *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache* (772) is noted.

Some light relief from this sombre mood is afforded by a display of the unquenchable 'Jones in Italy' type of work. I observe studies of 'Shakespeare in America' (2254), in Iceland (2257), in Catalunya (2260), in the 'new' Germany (2323), in France (2342), and in Soviet Russia (2343), and I mean to make a point of discovering whether such an outbreak is a yearly phenomenon.

I do not think it my business as a reviewer to check accuracy of reference in this volume: the editors will have had enough sense of responsibility to make

sure that it contains no more than the smallest margin of human error. But I find arrangement and classification occasionally faulty. On these points the *Annual Bibliography* has always tended to be weak, perhaps because its editors are anxious to omit nothing in any way relevant. But surely the time to call a halt comes sooner than they seem to think. Why, for instance, was a *Check List of Lincolniana* (55) included among bibliographies of English Literature? By what right do *Hölderlin's Sprachrhythmus* (1655), or *Forty Years of Jacobite Bibliography* (88), or *Film Research Libraries* (179), or an indifferent popular novel called *Stately Timber* (2623) find a place in this volume? By what astonishing logic can *Northern Paiute Tales* (1230) be classed with *The Cartulary of Missenden Abbey* (1346)? Apparently the editors give a wide interpretation to the term 'ancillary'. But they should stop somewhere short of taking away its meaning.

Apart from minor faults of this kind, and from one or two failures to give cross-references when an item appears a second time (1668/1689 and 1973/2034, for instance), the *Bibliography* maintains its old high quality, and will be as useful as always.

GEORGE KANE

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

### DIE ENGLISCHE SPRACHE

1. Jahrg., Heft 2, 1948

Daniel Defoe und die neuere Forschung (Gerhard Jacob), pp. 34-9.

### DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. 41, No. 3, June 1949

John Marston's *Sophonisba*: a reconsideration (Peter Ure), pp. 81-90.

### ELH

Vol. 16, No. 1, March 1949

The Romantic Movement: a selective and critical bibliography for the year 1948 (J. Raymond Derby), pp. 1-64.

Barnaby Rich and King James (T. M. Cranfill), pp. 65-75.

The Pleasures of Pity (A. O. Aldridge), pp. 76-87.

[Eighteenth-century theories about the source of pity.]

Vol. 16, No. 2, June 1949

Epicurus in Utopia (Edward L. Surtz), pp. 89-103.

[Epicureanism in More's *Utopia*.]

Milton's *Comus* as a failure in artistic compromise (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 104-19.

Milton and metaphysical art: an exploration (Arnold Stein), pp. 120-34.

Whig aesthetics: a phase of eighteenth-century taste (Samuel Klinger), pp. 135-50.

## ENGLISH STUDIES

*Vol. 30, No. 3, May 1949*

The problem of *Pericles* (Kenneth Muir), pp. 65-83.

Two notes to the Prologue of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (A. A. Prins), pp. 83-6.

[On ll. 173-6; continued from Vol. 30, pp. 42-4.]

The symbolic vowel in *ass*, *bastard*, *Catholic*, and others (Leonard Forster), pp. 86-91.

Current literature, 1948: Fiction, drama and poetry (Frederick T. Wood), pp. 97-109.

## FURMAN STUDIES

*Vol. XXXI, No. 5, Winter 1949*

Possible sources of 'The Cask of Amontillado' (C. L. Razor), pp. 46-50.

## HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

*Vol. 12, No. 3, May 1949*

Mary de la Rivière Manley, Tory defender (Gwendolyn B. Needham), pp. 253-88.

Dr. Johnson and Roman history (John Robert Moore), pp. 311-14.

[See Vol. 12, pp. 1-21.]

The military career of Thomas North (Harold H. Davis), pp. 315-21.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

*Vol. 44, No. 4, April 1949*

Keats's 'O for a Life of Sensations . . .' (Newell F. Ford), pp. 229-34.

Shakespeare's word-play on 'Tombe' (T. Walter Herbert), pp. 235-41.

[In Sonnet 83.]

'Wild Bells' in Bailey's *Festus*? (Hoxie N. Fairchild), pp. 256-8.

Caxton's original additions to the *Legenda Aurea* (Sister Mary Jeremy), pp. 259-61.

Medieval chess and the *Book of the Duchess* (W. H. French), pp. 261-4.

[See *M.L.N.* (xliii), 30-5.]

Chaucer's *Kankedort* [*Ty. and Cris.* ii, 1752] (John Webster Spargo), pp. 264-6.

*Vol. 44, No. 5, May 1949*

Poe's 'To Helen' (Paull F. Baum), pp. 289-97.

An echo from *The Spanish Tragedy* (Harry Levin), pp. 297-302.

[In Marston, Beaumont and Fletcher.]

Unity in *The Second Shepherd's Tale* (Francis J. Thompson), pp. 302-6.

Two irregular Chaucerian stanzas (J. Burke Severs), pp. 306-9.

[In *An A.B.C.* and *The Former Age.*]

A note on *The Rhythm of Beowulf* (Raymond E. Past), pp. 310-11.

Anglo-Saxon spinsters and Anglo-Saxon archers (Two steps towards a study in extension) (Roland M. Smith), pp. 312-15.

[See *M.L.N.* (xlii), 332.]

Geoffrey of Monmouth and Milton's *Comus* (R. Blenner-Hasset), pp. 315-18.



The bad weather in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Sidney Thomas), pp. 319-22.

Ophelia's 'Nothing' (Thomas Pyles), pp. 322-3.

Chaucer's 'Airish beasts' (W. Nelson Francis), pp. 339-41.

[*House of Fame*, ll. 941 ff.]

Chaucer's Philippa, daughter of Panneto (Haldeen Braddy), pp. 342-3.

A note on *The Man of Mode* (Arthur Sherbo), pp. 343-4.

Milton's aid to the *Polyglott Bible* (W. Arthur Turner), p. 345.

James Joyce's epiphanies (Joseph Prescott), p. 346.

*Beowulf* 249: *wlite* = Icelandic *litr* (Stefán Einarsson), p. 347.

Vol. 44, No. 6, June 1949

Lessing's *Faust Fragment* and *Romeo and Juliet* (John T. Krumpelmann), pp. 395-7.

Othello and Peregrina, 'richer than all his tribe' (Viola Hadlock Anderson), pp. 415-17.

[*Othello*, V. ii, 346-8.]

The earthquake in *Romeo and Juliet* (Sidney Thomas), pp. 417-19.

Dame Mary Etherege (John W. Nichol), pp. 419-22.

The university miscellanies: some neglected early texts of Cleveland and Cowley (Alberta Turner), pp. 423-4.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. 44, No. 1, January 1949

The Spanish plunder of William Drummond of Hawthornden (Matthew P. McDiarmid), pp. 17-25.

Arthur Dent's *Plaine Mans Path-Way to Heaven* (Maurice Hussey), pp. 26-34.

Middle English verse epistles (Arthur K. Moore), pp. 86-7.

*The Faerie Queene*: a reply (Janet Spens), pp. 87-8.

[See *M.L.R.* (xliii), 239-41.]

Greene's 'Ridstall Man' (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 88-9.

Two Milton notes (Wm. B. Hunter, Jr.), pp. 89-91.

[*Par. Lost*, viii, 94-7; *ib.*, xii, 632-4, 642-4.]

The publication of Warton's *Essay on Pope* (J. Kinsley), pp. 91-3.

The first printing of Byron's stanzas on the death of the Duke of Dorset (W. T. Bandy), pp. 93-4.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

31ste Jaarg., Aft. 2, 1 April 1949

*Leodum is Minum*: Beadohild's complaint (A. C. Bouman), pp. 103-13.

[Interpretation of the 'First Riddle' in the Exeter Book.]

A note on Shelley's 'Ozymandias' (W. van Maanen), pp. 123-5.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN (Helsinki)

Nos. 1-2, 1949

Patterns of tempo in *Richard III* (John W. Draper), pp. 1-12.

## NOTES AND QUERIES

*Vol. 194, No. 9, 30 April 1949*

Notes on 'Richard II' (A. D. Atkinson), pp. 190-2.

[Continued, 14 May, pp. 212-14.]

Four notes on the text of Dekker's *Shoemaker's Holiday* (J. George), p. 192.

*Vol. 194, No. 10, 14 May 1949*

Was Sir Thomas More a 'Roman Lawyer'? (R. J. Schoeck), p. 203.

Margarita, Marianna, and the Countess of Blessington (Thomas Pyles), pp. 209-10.

[In Mrs. Gore's *Cecil*.]

Keats's 'La Belle Dame sans Merci' (R. F. Rashbrook), p. 210.

[Links with the autumn of 1818.]

English visitors in Switzerland (G. R. de Beer), pp. 211-12.

[Gibbon's friends and acquaintances: continued, 28 May, pp. 233-4; 9 July, pp. 294-5.]

A borrowing from Seneca (Kenneth Muir), pp. 214-15, 216.

[Suggested parallels in *Macbeth* and Studley's *Agamemnon*.]

*Vol. 194, No. 11, 28 May 1949*

*Historic Doubts* concerning Perkin Warbeck (Michael Barrington), pp. 229-32.

[Horace Walpole and his predecessors.]

*Macbeth* and Warner's *Albion's England* (Peter Ure), pp. 232-3.

Wordsworth acknowledges his debt to travel books (Charles Norton Coe), pp. 234-5.

*Vol. 194, No. 12, 11 June 1949*

Marlowe and the voyagers (A. D. Atkinson), pp. 247-50.

[Continued, 25 June, pp. 273-5.]

Thomson's 'petrified city' (A. D. Atkinson), pp. 253-4.

[Origin of a description in Thomson's *Summer*.]

Gibbon and the *Gentleman's Magazine* (Francesco Cordasco), p. 254.

*Vol. 194, No. 13, 25 June 1949*

Two early Shakespeare allusions (G. Blakemore Evans), pp. 275-6.

[*Hamlet*, V, i; *Twelfth Night*, I, i.]

Another source of Poe's play, *Politian* (T. O. Mabbott), p. 279.

Notes on Yeats's 'Fragments' (A. Norman Jeffares), pp. 279-80.

*Vol. 194, No. 14, 9 July 1949*

Sir Fopling Flutter and Beau Hewitt (Arthur Sherbo), pp. 296-303.

Shakespeare's *Tempest*: an emendation (Howard Parsons), p. 303.

[V. i. 6.]

*Vol. 194, No. 15, 23 July 1949*

Grindal and Foxe (J. F. Mozley), pp. 313-15.

[See *N. & Q.*, Vol. 183, p. 126.]

Spenser and Ariosto (W. J. B. Owen), pp. 316-18.

Dr. Donne's art gallery (W. Milgate), pp. 318-19.

Milton's Sonnet 23 on his 'late espoused Saint' (Roland Mushat Frye and Charles R. Dahlberg), p. 321.

[See *R.E.S.* (xxi), 235-8.]

Bonnell Thornton's burlesque ode (Alan Dugald McKillop), pp. 321-4.  
[Praised by Johnson.]

Thomas Campbell: two letters (Charles Duffy and James Glennen), pp. 325, 326.

#### PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

*Vol. 28, No. 1, January 1949*

Some theories of the growth and origin of language in Milton's age (D. C. Allen), pp. 5-16.

Structural pattern in *Paradise Lost* (Arthur Barker), pp. 17-30.

Recent criticism of *Paradise Lost* (Douglas Bush), pp. 31-43.

The Trinity Manuscript and the dictation of *Paradise Lost* (John S. Diekhoff), pp. 44-52.

Latinate diction in Milton's English prose (Fred Emil Ekfelt), pp. 53-71.

Milton's private library—an additional title (Harris Fletcher), pp. 72-6.

Milton's homes and investments (J. Milton French), pp. 77-97.

Is *Samson Agonistes* unfinished? (Allan H. Gilbert), pp. 98-106.

Milton and the Sense of Glory (Merritt Y. Hughes), pp. 107-24.

The sources of Milton's prosody (William Bridges Hunter, Jr.), pp. 125-44.

The date of *Samson Agonistes* (William R. Parker), pp. 145-66.

A postscript to 'Give the Devil his due' (Elmer Edgar Stoll), pp. 167-84.

[See *R.E.S.* (xx), 108-24.]

Epic address and reference and the principle of decorum in *Paradise Lost* (Kester Svendsen), pp. 185-206.

Did Milton read Robert Crofts' *A Paradise Within Us or The Happie Mind*?

(George C. Taylor), pp. 207-10.

Notes on Milton's views on the Creation: the initial phases (A. S. P. Woodhouse), pp. 211-36.

#### PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

*Vol. 64, No. 2, May 1949*

American bibliography for 1948, pp. 3-89.

Research in progress in the modern languages and literatures (Robert G. Sawyer, editor), pp. 91-292.

*Vol. 64, No. 3, Part 1, June 1949*

A neglected source for literary biography (Richard D. Altick), pp. 319-24.  
[Private collections of, and books on, autographs.]

G. H. Lewes's criticism of the drama (Morris Greenhut), pp. 350-68.

The formal artistry of *Lavengro-Romany Rye* (John E. Tilford, Jr.), pp. 369-84.

Tennyson's 'Hail, Briton!' and 'Tithon' in the Heath Manuscript (Mary Joan Donahue), pp. 385-416.

Milton's 'Sonnet XX' (Fraser Neiman), pp. 480-3.

- Hamlet's 'God kissing carrion': a theory of the generation of life (John E. Hankins), pp. 507-16.  
 Shakespeare's stage blood and its critical significance (Leo Kirschbaum), pp. 517-29.  
 Thomas More and Communism (Edward L. Surtz), pp. 549-64.  
 Chaucer's Shipman and the wine (Margaret R. Stobie), pp. 565-9.  
 [Prologue, A. 396-7.]  
 Arthurian names: 'Arthur' (William A. Nitze), pp. 585-96.  
 [Interpretation and location of Arthur's battles.]  
 Ruskin satirized, 1857 (J. D. Jump), pp. 597-8.  
 [See *P.M.L.A.* (lxiii), 678-85.]  
 Emerson and Merlin's 'dungeon made of air' (B. J. Whiting), pp. 598-9.  
 [See *P.M.L.A.* (lxiii), 662-77.]  
 Spenser's Thomalin (Paul E. McLane), p. 599.  
 [See *P.M.L.A.* (lxii), 936-49.]  
 Chaucer's final -e (James G. Southworth and E. Talbot Donaldson), pp. 601-10.  
 [See *P.M.L.A.* (lxiii), 1101-24.]

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

## Vol. 46, No. 2, April 1949

- The defense of pleasure in More's *Utopia* (Edward L. Surtz), pp. 99-112.  
 Tragic retribution in the 1559 *Mirror for Magistrates* (William Peery), pp. 113-30.  
 'A cruell murder donne in Kent' and its literary manifestations (Joseph H. Marshburn), pp. 131-40.  
 [The murder of George Saunders in 1573.]  
 William Gager's *Oedipus* (R. H. Bowers), pp. 141-53.  
*Tamburlaine* sources once more (Hugh G. Dick), pp. 154-66.  
 The source of *Titus Andronicus* (Ralph M. Sargent), pp. 167-83.  
 Artistic unity in *Hamlet* (Pearl Hogrefe), pp. 184-95.  
 Daniel Tuvill's 'Resolves' (John Leon Lievsay), pp. 196-203.  
 [In *Christian Purposes and Resolutions*, 1622.]  
 Recent literature of the Renaissance: a bibliography, pp. 205-386.

## THE LIBRARY CHRONICLE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

## Vol. 3, No. 2, Fall 1948

- Tobias Smollett's translation of *Don Quixote* (Carmine Rocco Linsalata), pp. 55-68.  
 [Dependence on Jarvis's translation of 1742.]

## TULANE STUDIES IN ENGLISH

## Vol. I, 1949

- A conjecture concerning Chaucer's Pardoner (R. M. Lumiansky), pp. 1-29.  
 The World and the Artist: a study of Hawthorne's *The Artist of the Beautiful* (Richard Harter Fogle), pp. 31-52.  
*Venice Preserv'd* reconsidered (Aline Mackenzie), pp. 81-118.  
 The early history of *The Prelude* (George Wilbur Meyer), pp. 119-56.

# LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

January-June 1949

[Unless otherwise stated, the date of each publication is 1949.]

- AMES, R. *Citizen Thomas More and His Utopia*. Princeton. pp. viii+230. \$3.50.
- APP, A. J. *The True Concept of Literature*. San Antonio, 1948. pp. vi+110. \$1.00.
- ARTHOS, J. *The Language of Natural Description in Eighteenth-Century Poetry*. Ann Arbor. pp. xiv+463. \$6.00.
- ASPINALL, A. *Politics and the Press, c. 1780-1850*. London. pp. xvi+511. 42s.
- BAUGH, A. C. (ed.). *A Literary History of England*. New York, 1948. pp. xii+1673. \$10.00.
- BHATE, M. G. *Literature and Literary Criticism*. Bombay, 1948. pp. 152. No price given.
- BLACKSTONE, B. *English Blake*. Cambridge. pp. xviii+455. 25s.
- BOAS, F. S. (ed.). *The Change of Crowns. A Tragi-Comedy*. London. pp. viii+99. 10s. 6d.
- BOWDEN, MURIEL. *A Commentary on the General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales*. New York, 1948. pp. xii+316. \$4.00; 20s.
- BOWERS, F. (ed.). *Papers of the Bibliographical Society Univ. of Virginia. Vol. 1, 1948-1949*. Charlottesville, 1948. pp. 207. \$3.50.
- BROWN, W. C. *The Triumph of Form*. Chapel Hill, 1948. pp. x+212. \$3.50; 20s.
- BROWNING, R. *Essay on Chatterton*. Ed. D. Smalley. Cambridge, Mass., 1948. pp. xii+194. \$3.50.
- BULLOUGH, G. *The Trend of Modern Poetry*. 3rd edn. Edinburgh. pp. xii+150. 12s. 6d.
- BUSH, D. *Paradise Lost in Our Time*. New York, 1948. (Reprint.) pp. x+118. No price given.
- CHASE, R. *Quest for Myth*. Baton Rouge. pp. xii+150. \$3.25.
- CHAUCER, G. *The Canterbury Tales*. Modern English Prose Translation by R. M. Lumiansky. New York, 1948. pp. xxx+346. \$2.95.
- CHRISTOPHERSEN, P. *Bilingualism*. London. pp. 16. 1s.
- COLERIDGE, S. T. *The Philosophical Lectures*, ed. Kathleen Coburn. London. pp. 480. 25s.
- CROSTON, A. K. (ed.). *Two Seventeenth-Century Prefaces*. Liverpool. pp. xii+52. 3s. 6d.
- DANBY, J. F. *Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature. A Study of King Lear*. London. pp. 234. 16s.
- DANIEL, S. *The Tragedy of Philotas*. Ed. L. Michel. New Haven. pp. xii+183. 21s.
- DAVIDSON, E. H. *Hawthorne's Last Phase*. New Haven. pp. xviii+174. \$3.75; 21s.
- DEFOE, DANIEL. *An Essay on the Regulation of the Press*. Introd. J. R. Moore. (Luttrell Society Reprints, No. 7.) Oxford, 1948. pp. xvi+30. Annual Subscription 25s.
- DILLON, M. *Early Irish Literature*. Chicago, 1948. pp. xx+192. 20s.
- FORSSTRÖM, G. *The Verb 'To Be' in Middle English*. Lund, 1948. pp. 237. Kr. 12.
- FÖRSTER, M. *Altenglisches Lesebuch für Anfänger*. 5 Aufl. Heidelberg. pp. xii+75. DM. 4.20.
- GILBERT, A. H. *The Symbolic Persons in the Masques of Ben Jonson*. Durham, N.C., 1948. pp. xii+298+71 plates. 33s.
- HALL, JOSEPH. *Heaven vpon Earth and Characters of Vertues and Vices*. Ed. R. Kirk. New Brunswick, 1948. pp. xvi+214. \$5.00.
- HART, J. D. *The Oxford Companion to American Literature*. 2nd edn. New York, 1948. pp. viii+890. 42s.
- HAUSTED, P. *Semile Odium*. Ed. and trans. L. J. Mills. Bloomington. pp. 202. \$3.50.
- HUGHES, L., and A. H. SCOUTEN. *Ten English Farces*. Austin, Tx., 1948. pp. xiv+286. No price given.
- JEFFARES, A. N. W. B. *Yeats Man and Poet*. London. pp. viii+365. 21s.
- JOHANNISSON, T. *Hava och Vara som Tempusbildande Hjälpverb i de nordiska Språken*. Lund, 1945. pp. 244. Kr. 10.
- JUMP, J. D. (ed.). *Rollo Duke of Normandy*. Liverpool, 1948. pp. xxxiv+107. 15s.
- JUNGANDREAS, W. *Geschichte der deutschen und der englischen Sprache. Teil III. Geschichte der englischen Sprache*. Göttingen. pp. 270. DM. 9.80.
- KEATS, J. *The Keats Circle. Letters 1816-1878*. Ed. H. E. Rollins. Cambridge, Mass., 1948. 2 vols. pp. cl+332; vi+519. 70s.
- *The Letters. Selected Passages*. Ed. with Notes by H. W. Häusermann. Berne. pp. 120. Sw. fr. 5.80.

- KENNEDY, C. W. *The Poems of Cynewulf Translated into English Prose*. 2nd edn. New York. pp. xii+347. \$4.00.
- KEYNES, G. *Blake Studies*. London. pp. xiv+210. 48 plates. 42s.
- KNAPP, L. M. Tobias Smollett. Doctor of Men and Manners. Princeton. pp. xiv+362. \$5.00.
- KNIGHT, G. W. *The Wheel of Fire* (4th edn. revised and enlarged). London. pp. xx+343. 21s.
- LACEY, N. Wordsworth's View of Nature. Cambridge, 1948. pp. viii+128. 8s. 6d.
- LOVEJOY, A. O. *Essays in the History of Ideas*. Baltimore, 1948. pp. xviii+359. \$5.00; 27s. 6d.
- MARTIN, B. *The Ancient Mariner and the Authentic Narrative*. London. pp. iv+82. 7s. 6d.
- MERSAND, JOS. *The American Drama Since 1930*. New York. pp. 188. \$2.00.
- MOSSÉ, F. *Manuel de l'Anglais du Moyen Âge*. II. *Moyen-Anglais*. 2 tomes. Paris. pp. 380; 192.
- NOYES, G. R., and H. R. MEAD. *An Essay upon Satyr . . . London . . . Dring . . . 1680*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1948. pp. 139-56. 35c.
- O'CONNOR, W. V. (ed.). *Forms of Modern Fiction*. Minneapolis, 1948. pp. viii+305. 25s.
- PATMORE, C. *The Poems*. Ed. F. Page. London. pp. xxviii+506. 8s. 6d.
- PEACEY, H. *The Meaning of the Alphabet*. Los Angeles. pp. 96. \$3.00.
- POIRIER, M. *Sir Philip Sidney*. Lille, 1948. pp. 322. No price given.
- READ, H., and B. DOBRÉE. *The London Book of English Verse*. London. pp. xxxvi+874. 12s. 6d.
- ROLLO, HA. *The Doom of the Gods*. London. pp. xiv+105. 12s. 6d.
- SCHAAR, C. *Critical Studies in the Cynewulf Group*. Lund. pp. 337. Kr. 15.
- SCHAUBERT, E. VON. *Bedeutung und Herkunft von ae. 'feormian' und seiner Sippe*. Göttingen. pp. 120. DM. 15.
- SEDGEWICK, G. G. *Of Irony Especially in Drama*. 2nd edn. Toronto. pp. xii+127. \$2.75; 15s.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *Shakespeare's King Lear*. Ed. G. I. Duthie. Oxford. pp. x+425. 25s.
- *Shakespeare Survey 2*. Ed. A. Nicoll. Cambridge. pp. viii+164. 12s. 6d.
- SPENSER, E. *Works*, Variorum Edition. Prose Works, ed. R. Gottfried. Baltimore. pp. xvi+570. \$8.00.
- STALLMAN, R. W. (sel.). *Critiques and Essays in Criticism 1920-1948*. Introd. C. Brooks. New York. pp. xxii+571. \$5.00.
- STEARNS, M. W. *Robert Henryson*. New York. pp. x+155. \$2.50; 14s.
- STEPNEY, G. *Translation of the Eighth Satire of Juvenal*. Ed. and Introd. Thomas and Elizabeth Swedenberg. California, 1948. pp. ii+68. 10s. 6d.
- STEVENSON, B. (sel.). *Stevenson's Book of Proverbs, Maxims and Familiar Phrases*. London. pp. viii+2957. 84s.
- STEWART, R. *Nathaniel Hawthorne. A Biography*. New Haven, 1948. pp. viii+279. \$4.00.
- STOKES, F. G. *A Dictionary of the Characters & Proper Names in the Works of Shakespeare*. 2nd edn. New York. pp. xvi+360. \$6.75.
- STRAUMANN, H. *Byron and Switzerland*. Nottingham. pp. 26. 1s. 6d.
- SWART, J. *Thomas Sackville*. Groningen. pp. vi+140. 4.50 fl.
- TAYLOR, A. *The Literary Riddle before 1600*. California, 1948. pp. viii+131. 15s.
- TYMMS, R. *Doubles in Literary Psychology*. Cambridge. pp. 126. 12s. 6d.
- WALPOLE, HORACE. *Correspondence*. Vols. 13 and 14 (in one). Ed. W. S. Lewis, G. L. Lam and C. H. Bennett. London, 1948. pp. lviii+250; viii+315. 94s. 6d.
- WATKINS, F. *The Political Tradition of the West*. Cambridge, Mass., 1948. pp. xiv+368. \$5.00; 55s.
- WIDÉN, B. *Studies on the Dorset Dialect*. Lund. pp. 179. Kr. 10.
- WIMSATT, W. K., Jr. *Philosophic Words. A Study of Style and Meaning in the Rambler and Dictionary of Samuel Johnson*. New Haven, 1948. pp. xx+167. \$3.75; 21s.



# INDEX

- Abercrombie, D., rev. by, 369  
*Academies of the Sixteenth Century, The French*, by Frances A. Yates, revd., 263  
 Actors at Ghent in the Seventeenth Century, English, art. by H. R. Hoppe, 305  
 Addison, Joseph. *Men of Letters and the English Public* . . ., Dryden, A., Pope, by Alexandre Beljame, ed. B. Dobrée, tr. E. O. Lorimer, revd., 363  
 Æschere, The Hand of: A Note on *Beowulf* 1343, note by L. Whitbread, 339  
*American English, The Intonation of*, by K. L. Pike, revd., 369  
*American Speech. A Quarterly of Linguistic Usage*, vol. xxii, no. 2, noticed, 92  
*Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse*, by H. Sweet. Tenth edit., revised . . . C. T. Onions, noticed, 282  
 Angus, W. S., rev. by, 65  
 Armytage, W. H. G., note by, Matthew Arnold and Richard Cobden in 1864: Some Recently Discovered Letters, 249  
 Arnold, Matthew. M.A. and the *Spectator*, note by J. D. Jump, 61; M.A. and Richard Cobden in 1864: Some Recently Discovered Letters, note by W. H. G. Armytage, 249; *M.A., poète*, by L. Bonnerot, revd., 177; *M.A. Empédocle sur l'Etna. Étude critique et traduction*, by L. Bonnerot, revd., 177  
 Atkins, J. W. H., *English Literary Criticism: The Renaissance*, revd., 70  
 Baldwin, T. W., *Shakspere's Five-Act Structure. Shakspere's Early Plays on the Background of Renaissance Theories of Five-Act Structure from 1470*, revd., 359  
*Baroque Literature in England*, by M. Mincoff, revd., 74  
 Batho, Edith C., rev. by, 280  
 Beaumont, Francis. *Fletcher, B. and Company. Entertainers to the Jacobean Gentry*, by L. B. Wallis, revd., 74  
 Beljame, A., *Men of Letters and the English Public in the Eighteenth Century, 1660-1744*, Dryden, Addison, Pope, ed. B. Dobrée, tr. E. O. Lorimer, revd., 363  
 Bennett, J. A. W., rev. by, 161  
 Bentley, Phyllis. *The Brontës*, noticed, 185  
*Beowulf. The Hand of Æschere: A Note on B. 1343*, note by L. Whitbread, 339  
 Bethell, S. L., rev. by, 167  
 Bibliography. *Wordsworthian Criticism: A Guide and B.*, by J. V. Logan, revd., 87; *Annual B. of English Language and Literature*, vol. xx, 1939, ed. A. Macdonald and L. N. Broughton, revd., 370  
 Boas, F. S., ed. *The Year's Work in English Studies*, vol. xxvi, 1945, revd., 182  
 Bonnerot, L., *Matthew Arnold, poète*, revd., 177; *Matthew Arnold. Empédocle sur l'Etna. Étude critique et traduction*, revd., 177  
 Boyce, B., *The Theophrastan Character in England to 1642*, revd., 272  
 British Museum. *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires preserved . . . in the B.M.*, vol. viii, 1801-1810, by Mary Dorothy George, revd., 173  
 Brontës, *The*, by Phyllis Bentley, noticed, 185  
 Brooks, H. F., art. by, *The 'Imitation' in English Poetry, especially in Formal Satire, before the Age of Pope*, 124  
 Broughton, L. N. See Macdonald, A.  
 Butt, J., notice by, 90, 283  
 Callan, N., rev. by, 277  
*Catalogue of . . . Satires preserved in . . . the British Museum*, vol. viii, 1801-1810, by Mary Dorothy George, revd., 173  
*Chansons, Elizabéthaines, Les*, by F. Delattre and C. Chemin, revd., 356  
 Chaucer, Geoffrey. *An Interpretation of C.'s Knight's Tale*, art. by W. Frost, 289; *Characterization in C.'s Knight's Tale*, by A. H. Marckwardt, noticed, 89; *A C. Handbook*, by R. D. French, noticed, 184  
 Chemin, C. See Delattre, F.  
 Chinese Fables and anti-Walpole Journalism, art. by T. C. Fan, 141  
 Clark, D. L., *John Milton at St. Paul's School. A Study of Ancient Rhetoric in English Renaissance Education*, revd., 362  
 Clark, William Andrews, *Memorial Library. Report . . . 1934-44*, noticed, 185  
 Clifford, J. L., Kirk, R., and Robertson, D. A., Jr., ed. *English Institute Essays 1946*, revd., 281  
 Cobden, Richard. Matthew Arnold and R. C. in 1864: Some Recently Discovered Letters, note by W. H. G. Armytage, 249  
*Colloquial Element in English Poetry, The*, by C. Day Lewis, noticed, 91  
*Common-Sense 1737-1738, The Nonsense of*, by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, ed. R. Halsband, revd., 83  
*Conflict of Conscience*, John Foxe and *The*, art. by L. M. Oliver, 1  
 Conklin, P. S., *A History of 'Hamlet' Criticism, 1601-1821*, revd., 168  
 Cooke, J. E., *Poe as a Literary Critic*, ed. N. B. Fagin, noticed, 184

- Correspondence of Sir Thomas More, The*, ed. Elizabeth F. Rogers, revd., 354
- Cottle, A. B., rev. by, 351
- Cotton, William. *Thomas Nashe and W. C.*, note by E. D. Mackerness, 342
- Cowley, Abraham. *The Date of C.'s Davideis*, note by F. Kermodé, 154
- Craig, H., rev. by, 263
- Croston, A. K., rev. by, 272
- Darbishire, Helen. See Selincourt, E. de
- Davideis*, Cowley's, *The Date of*, note by F. Kermodé, 154
- Davin, D. M., rev. by, 281
- Davis, H., ed. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, vol. ix, revd., 274
- Davis, N., rev. by, 160
- Dean, L. F., *Tudor Theories of History Writing*, noticed, 90
- Defoe, Daniel. *The Naming of Characters in D.*, Richardson, and Fielding, art. by I. P. Watt, 322
- Delattre, F. and Chemin, C., *Les Chansons Elizabethaines*, revd., 356
- Della Casa. *The Influence of Tasso and Della Casa on Milton's Diction*, art. by F. T. Prince, 222
- Dobrée, B., ed. *Men of Letters and the English Public . . .*, Dryden, Addison, Pope, by A. Beljame, revd., 363
- Dockhorn, K., *Wordsworth und die rhetorische Tradition in England*, revd., 176
- Donne, John. D. and Paracelsus: *An Essay in Interpretation*, art. by W. A. Murray, 115
- Donner, H. W., rev. by, 259
- Drama and dramatists. John Foxe and *The Conflict of Conscience*, art. by L. M. Oliver, 1; *The Very Pompes of the Divell—Popular and Folk Elements in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, art. by D. Hewitt, 10; *The Date of Romeo and Juliet*, note by J. W. Draper, 55; *Baroque Literature in England*, by M. Mincoff, revd., 74; *Fletcher, Beaumont and Company. Entertainers to the Jacobean Gentry*, by L. B. Wallis, revd., 74; *The Language of Tragedy*, by M. E. Prior, revd., 88; *A History of 'Hamlet' Criticism 1601-1821*, by P. S. Conklin, revd., 168; *Shakespeare und der Tragödienstil seiner Zeit*, by Levin L. Schücking, revd., 357
- Draper, J. W., note by, *The Date of Romeo and Juliet*, 55
- Dryden, John. *Men of Letters and the English Public . . .*, D., Addison, Pope, by Alexandre Beljame, ed. B. Dobrée, tr. E. O. Lorimer, revd., 363
- Elizabethan Poetry in the Eighteenth Century*, by E. R. Wasserman, revd., 367
- Emden, C. S., art. by, *Rhythmical Features in Dr. Johnson's Prose*, 38
- English Institute Essays 1946*, ed. J. L. Clifford, R. Kirk, and D. A. Robertson, Jr., revd., 281
- English Language and Literature, Annual Bibliography of*, vol. xx, 1939, ed. A. Macdonald and L. N. Broughton, revd., 370
- English Literary Criticism: The Renaissance*, by J. W. H. Atkins, revd., 70
- English Studies, The Year's Work in*, vol. xxvi, 1945, ed. F. S. Boas, revd., 182
- Epigram in the English Renaissance, The*, by H. H. Hudson, revd., 71
- Everett, Dorothy, notice by, 184
- Everyman. A Comparative Study of Texts and Sources*, by H. de Vocht, revd., 66
- Fagin, N. B., ed. *Poe as a Literary Critic*, by J. E. Cooke, noticed, 184
- Fan, T. C., art. by, *Chinese Fables and anti-Walpole Journalism*, 141
- Fielding, Henry. *The Naming of Characters in Defoe, Richardson, and F.*, art. by I. P. Watt, 322
- Fisch, H., art. by, *Bishop Hall's Meditations*, 210
- Fletcher, G. B. A., notice by, 185
- Fletcher, John. *F., Beaumont and Company. Entertainers to the Jacobean Gentry*, by L. B. Wallis, revd., 74
- Flower, R., *The Irish Tradition*, revd., 180
- Foxe, John. J. F. and *The Conflict of Conscience*, art. by L. M. Oliver, 1
- French, R. D., *A Chaucer Handbook*, noticed, 184
- Frost, W., art. by, *An Interpretation of Chaucer's Knight's Tale*, 289
- Garrod, H. W., rev. by, 71
- Gawayne, Sir, and the Green Knight* (in Modern English), by K. Hare, with introd., &c., by R. M. Wilson, revd., 350
- George, Mary Dorothy, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, vol. viii, 1801-1810, revd., 173
- Gist, Margaret Adlum, *Love and War in the Middle English Romances*, revd., 351
- Godwin, William, *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and its Influence on Morals and Happiness*, ed. F. E. L. Priestley, 3 vols., revd., 278
- Gordon, D. J., notice by, 184
- Gradon, Pamela, notice by, 91, 92
- Grant, D., introd. *Private letters of the Seventeenth Century*, by Sir W. Scott, Bart., revd., 280; rev. by, 83
- Hall, Joseph. *Bishop H.'s Meditations*, art. by H. Fisch, 210
- Halsband, R., ed. *The Nonsense of Common-Sense 1737-1738*, by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, revd., 83

- Handel, George Frederick. *H.'s Messiah. A Touchstone of Taste*, by R. M. Myers, noticed, 283
- Hardy, Thomas. *The Poetry of T. H.*, by J. G. Southworth, noticed, 283
- Harc, K., *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* (in Modern English), with introd., &c., by R. M. Wilson, revd., 350
- Häusermann, H. W., note by. *A New Scott Letter*, 248
- Heinemann, F. H., note by, John Toland, France, Holland, and Dr. Williams, 346
- Herbert, Edward, first Baron Herbert of Cherbury. *La Vita, le Opere, I Tempi di Edoardo Herbert di Chirbury*, by Mario M. Rossi, 3 vols., revd., 170
- Hewitt, D., art. by, *The Very Pompes of the Divell—Popular and Folk Elements in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, 10
- Hogg, James. *The Life and Letters of J. H. the Ettrick Shepherd*, vol. i (1770-1825), by A. L. Strout, revd., 174
- Hoppe, H. R., art. by, *English Actors at Ghent in the Seventeenth Century*, 305
- Horne, C. J., rev. by, 367
- Houghton, W. E., *The Art of Newman's 'Apologia'*, revd., 179
- Hudson, H. H., *The Epigram in the English Renaissance*, revd., 71
- Hughes, E., rev. by, 173
- Humphreys, A. R., rev. by, 278
- 'Imitation', *The*, in *English Poetry*, especially in *Formal Satire*, before the Age of Pope, art. by H. F. Brooks, 124
- Irish Tradition, The*, by R. Flower, revd., 180
- Jefferies, A. N., rev. by, 180
- Johnson, Samuel. *Rhythmical Features in Dr. J.'s Prose*, art. by C. S. Emden, 38
- Jones, C. W., *Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England*, revd., 65
- Joseph, Sr. Miriam, C. S. C., *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language*, revd., 269
- Judson, A. C., *The Life of Edmund Spenser*, revd., 261
- Jump, J. D., note by, Matthew Arnold and the *Spectator*, 61
- Kane, G., rev. by, 370
- Keats, John. K. and W. C. Wells, note by H. W. Piper, 158
- Kermode, F., note by, *The Date of Cowley's Davideis*, 154; rev. by, 265, 356
- Killigrew, Thomas. *The Whereabouts of T. K.*, 1639-41, note by J. W. Stoye, 245
- Kirk, R. See Clifford, J. L.
- Kirschbaum, L., note by, *A Detail in King Lear*, 153
- Koszul, A., notice by, 282
- Kurze Geschichte der englischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, by W. F. Schirmer, revd., 183
- Landa, L., (Introd. Essay and Notes on the Sermons). *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. H. Davis, vol. ix, revd., 274
- Leech, C., rev. by, 74
- Leishman, J. B., rev. by, 357
- Lewis, C. Day, *The Colloquial Element in English Poetry*, noticed, 91
- Leyden, W. von, rev. by, 170
- Library Resources of the University of North Carolina*, ed. C. E. Rush, noticed, 185
- Lindheim, B. von, art. by, OE. 'Dræm' and its Subsequent Development, 193
- Linguistics. *Studier i Modern Språkvetskap*, vols. xv, xvi, noticed, 91; *American Speech. A Quarterly of Linguistic Usage*, vol. xxii, no. 2, noticed, 92; *Studia linguistica. Revue de linguistique générale et comparée*, vol. i, no. 1, noticed, 92
- Liriche religiose inglesi del secolo quattordicesimo*, tr. Alfredo Obertello, revd., 352
- Literature, Royal Society of. *Essays by Divers Hands: being the Transactions of the R.S.L. of the United Kingdom*. New Series, vol. xxiii, ed. H. Nicolson, noticed, 186
- Lockwood, J. F., *The Tradition of Scholarship*, noticed, 185
- Logan, J. V., *Wordsworthian Criticism: A Guide and Bibliography*, revd., 87
- Loomis, R. S., and Willard, R., *Medieval English Verse and Prose in Modernized Versions*, revd., 350
- Lorimer, E. O., tr. *Men of Letters and the English Public . . . Dryden, Addison, Pope*, by A. Beljame, revd., 363
- Love and Truth and Thealma and Clearchus*, Izaak Walton as Author of, art. by H. J. Oliver, 24
- Love and War in the Middle English Romances*, by Margaret Adlum Gist, revd., 351
- Lyrics, Elizabethan. *Les Chansons Elizabethaines*, by F. Delattre and C. Chemin, revd., 356
- Lyrics, Fourteenth-century English religious. *Liriche religiose inglesi del secolo quattordicesimo*, tr. Alfredo Obertello, revd., 352
- Macdonald, A. *Summary of Periodical Literature*, 371; rev. by, 182, 350; notice by, 89, 186
- and Broughton, L. N., ed. *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*, vol. xx, 1939, revd., 370
- Macdonald, H., rev. by, 273, 363
- McIntosh, A., rev. by, 258
- Mackerness, E. D., note by, Thomas Nashe and William Cotton, 342
- McKisack, May, notice by, 90
- Maguire, Stella, art. by, *The Significance of Haukyn, Activa Vita*, in *Piers Plowman*, 97

- Malory, Sir Thomas. *The Works of Sir T. M.*, ed. E. Vinaver, 3 vols., revd., 161
- Marckwardt, A. H., *Characterization in Chaucer's Knight's Tale*, noticed, 89
- Martin, L. C., rev. by, 362
- Medieval English Verse and Prose in Modernized Versions*, by R. S. Loomis and R. Willard, revd., 350
- Men of Letters and the English Public in the Eighteenth Century 1660-1744*, Dryden, Addison, Pope, by Alexandre Beljame, ed. B. Dobrée, tr. E. O. Lorimer, revd., 363
- Messiah, Handel's. A Touchstone of Taste*, by R. M. Myers, noticed, 283
- Middle English. 'Sixty' as an Indefinite Number in ME, note by Susie I. Tucker, 152; *The Rivalry of Scandinavian and Native Synonyms in ME*, especially taken and nimen, by A. Rynell, revd., 258; *Love and War in the ME Romances*, by Margaret Adlum Gist, revd., 351; *Foreign Influences on ME*, noticed, 89.
- Milton, John. The Influence of Tasso and Della Casa on M.'s Diction, art. by F. T. Prince, 222; M.'s Sonnet on his 'Late Espoused Saint', note by F. Pyle, 57; *Paradise Regained: The Tradition and the Poem*, by Elizabeth M. Pope, revd., 75; *Paradise Lost and the Seventeenth Century Reader*, by B. Rajan, revd., 75; *Paradise Lost and its Critics*, by A. J. A. Waldock, revd., 75; J. M. at St. Paul's School. *A Study of Ancient Rhetoric in English Renaissance Education*, by D. L. Clark, revd., 362
- Mincoff, M., *Baroque Literature in England*, revd., 74
- Modernized Versions, Medieval English Verse and Prose in*, by R. S. Loomis and R. Willard, revd., 350 [cf. *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*].
- Montagu, Mrs. Elizabeth. Mrs. M. and the Climbing-Boys, art. by G. L. Phillips, 237
- Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley, *The Nonsense of Common-Sense 1737-1738*, ed. R. Halsband, revd., 83
- More, Sir Thomas (St.). *Nowhere was Somewhere. How History Makes Utopias and How Utopias Make History*, by A. E. Morgan, revd., 259; *The Correspondence of Sir T. M.*, ed. Elizabeth F. Rogers, revd., 354
- Morgan, A. E., *Nowhere was Somewhere. How History Makes Utopias and How Utopias Make History*, revd., 259
- Morley, Edith J., rev. by, 176
- Murray, W. A., art. by, Donne and Paracelsus: An Essay in Interpretation, 115
- Music and Poetry of the English Renaissance*, by B. Pattison, revd., 265
- Nashe, Thomas. T. N. and William Cotton, note by E. D. Mackerness, 342
- Newman, John Henry. *The Art of N.'s 'Apologia'*, by W. E. Houghton, revd., 179
- Nicolson, H., *Tennyson's Two Brothers*, noticed, 90; ed. *Essays by Divers Hands: being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom*, New Series, vol. xxiii, noticed, 186
- Nosworthy, J. M., rev. by, 359
- Nowhere was Somewhere. How History Makes Utopias and How Utopias Make History*, by A. E. Morgan, revd., 259
- Obertello, A., tr. *Liriche religiose inglesi del secolo quattordicesimo*, revd., 352
- Old English. OE. 'Dream' and its Subsequent Development, art. by B. von Lindheim, 193; *The Syncope of the OE Present Endings: A Dialect Criterion*, by J. Hedberg, revd., 160
- Oliver, H. J., art. by, Izaak Walton as Author of *Love and Truth* and *Thealma and Clearchus*, 24
- Oliver, L. M., art. by, John Foxe and *The Conflict of Conscience*, 1
- Onions, C. T., (revised) *Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse*, by H. Sweet. Tenth edit., noticed, 282
- Page, B. S., notice by, 185
- Palmerin Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction, The*, by Mary Patchell, revd., 68
- Paracelsus, Donne and: An Essay in Interpretation, art. by W. A. Murray, 115
- Patchell, Mary, *The Palmerin Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction*, revd., 68
- Pattison, B., *Music and Poetry of the English Renaissance*, revd., 265
- Periodical Literature, Summary of, by Kathleen Tillotson, 93, 187, 284; by A. Macdonald, 371
- Phillips, G. L., art. by, Mrs. Montagu and the Climbing-Boys, 237
- Phonetics. *The Intonation of American English*, by K. L. Pike, revd., 369
- Piers Plowman, The Significance of* Haukyn, *Activa Vita*, in, art. by Stella Maguire, 97
- Pike, K. L., *The Intonation of American English*, revd., 369
- Pinto, V. de S., notice by, 91, 283
- Piper, H. W., note by, Keats and W. C. Wells, 158
- Poe, Edgar Allan. *P. as a Literary Critic*, by J. E. Cooke, ed. N. B. Fagin, noticed, 184
- Poetry of the English Renaissance, Music and*, by B. Pattison, revd., 265
- Pons, E., rev. by, 364
- Pope, Alexander. *Men of Letters and The English Public . . . , Dryden, Addison, P.*

- by Alexandre Beljame, ed. B. Dobrée, tr. E. O. Lorimer, revd., 363
- Pope, Elizabeth M., *Paradise Regained: The Tradition and the Poem*, revd., 75
- Price, H. T., *Foreign Influences on Middle English*, noticed, 89
- Priestley, F. E. L., ed. W. Godwin's *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and its Influence on Morals and Happiness*, 3 vols., revd., 278
- Prince, F. T., art. by, *The Influence of Tasso and Della Casa on Milton's Diction*, 222
- Prior, M. E., *The Language of Tragedy*, revd., 88
- Publications received, list of, 191, 377
- Purves, J., rev. by, 352
- Pyle, F., note by, *Milton's Sonnet on his 'Late Espoused Saint'*, 57
- Rajan, B., *Paradise Lost and the Seventeenth Century Reader*, revd., 75
- Reed, A. W., rev. by, 354
- Renwick, W. L., rev. by, 261
- Reyher, P., *Essai sur les idées dans l'œuvre de Shakespeare*, revd., 167
- Richardson, Samuel, *The Naming of Characters in Defoe, R., and Fielding*, art. by I. P. Watt, 322
- Robertson, D. A. See Clifford, J. L.
- Robson-Scott, W. D., rev. by, 183
- Rogers, Elizabeth Frances, ed. *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*, revd., 354
- Rossi, M. M., *La Vita, Le Opere, I Tempi di Edoardo Herbert di Chirbury*, 3 vols., revd., 170
- Rowe, K. T., *Romantic Love and Parental Authority in Sydney's 'Arcadia'*, noticed, 282
- Royal Society, *The Origins of the*, by R. H. Syfret, revd., 273
- Rush, C. E., ed. *Library Resources of the University of North Carolina*, noticed, 185
- Rynell, A., *The Rivalry of Scandinavian and Native Synonyms in Middle English*, especially taken and nimen, revd., 258
- Sadleir, M., (introd.) *An Autobiography*, by A. Trollope, noticed, 90
- Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England*, by C. W. Jones, revd., 65
- Sarmiento, E., rev. by, 68
- Schirmer, W. F., *Kurze Geschichte der englischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, revd., 183
- Schücking, L. L., *Shakespeare und der Tragödienstil seiner Zeit*, revd., 357
- Scott, Sir Walter, A New S. Letter, note by H. W. Häusermann, 248; *Private Letters of the Seventeenth Century*, with Introd. by D. Grant, revd., 280
- Selincourt, E. de and Darbishire, Helen, ed. *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth. Miscellaneous Sonnets*, . . . *Ecclesiastical Sonnets*, revd., 84
- Shakespeare, William. *The Bibliographical Links between the First Two Quartos of Romeo and Juliet*, art. by S. Thomas, 110; *The Date of Romeo and Juliet*, note by J. W. Draper, 55; *A Detail in King Lear*, note by L. Kirschbaum, 153; *Essai sur les idées dans l'œuvre de S.*, by Paul Reyher, revd., 167; *A History of 'Hamlet' Criticism, 1601-1821*, by P. S. Conklin, revd., 168; *S.'s Use of the Arts of Language*, by Sr. Miriam Joseph, C.S.C., revd., 269; *S. und der Tragödienstil seiner Zeit*, by Levin L. Schücking, revd., 357; *Shakspeare's Five-Act Structure*, . . . by T. W. Baldwin, revd., 359
- Sidney, Sir Philip. *Romantic Love and Parental Authority in Sydney's 'Arcadia'*, by K. T. Rowe, noticed, 282
- 'Sixty' as an Indefinite Number in Middle English, note by Susie I. Tucker, 152
- Smart, Christopher, *Hymns for the Amusement of Children*, with an introduction by E[dmund] B[lunden], revd., 277
- Southworth, J. G., *The Poetry of Thomas Hardy*, noticed, 283
- Spectator*, Matthew Arnold and the, note by J. D. Jump, 61
- Spenser, Edmund. *The Life of E. S.*, by A. C. Judson, revd., 261
- Stewart, J. I. M., rev. by, 168
- Stoye, J. W., note by, *The Whereabouts of Thomas Killigrew, 1639-41*, 245
- Strout, A. L., *The Life and Letters of James Hogg the Ettrick Shepherd*, vol. i (1770-1825), revd., 174
- Studia Linguistica. Revue de linguistique générale et comparée*, vol. i, no. 1, noticed, 92
- Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap*, vols. xv, xvi, noticed, 91
- Sutherland, J. R., rev. by, 172
- Sweet, H., *Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse*. Tenth edit., revised . . . C. T. Onions, noticed, 282
- Swift, Jonathan. *Prose Works*, ed. H. Davis, vol. ix. *Irish Tracts 1720-1723 and Sermons*. With Introd. Essay and Notes on the Sermons by L. Landa, revd., 274; *Journal to Stella*, ed. H. Williams, vol. i, revd., 364
- Syfret, R. H., *The Origins of the Royal Society*, revd., 273
- Syncope, The, of the Old English Present Endings: A Dialect Criterion*, by Johannes Hedberg, revd., 160
- Synonyms in Middle English, The Rivalry of Scandinavian and Native, especially taken and nimen*, by A. Rynell, revd., 258



- Tasso, Torquato. *The Influence of T. and Della Casa on Milton's Diction*, art. by F. T. Prince, 222
- Taylor, W. D., rev. by, 174
- Tennyson, Alfred. *T's Two Brothers*, by H. Nicolson, noticed, 90
- Thealma and Clearchus*, Izaak Walton as Author of *Love and Truth* and, art. by H. J. Oliver, 24
- Theophrastan Character in England to 1642*, *The*, by B. Boyce, revd., 272
- Thomas, S., art. by, *The Bibliographical Links between the First Two Quartos of Romeo and Juliet*, 110
- Tillotson, G., rev. by, 84, 179
- Tillotson, Kathleen, *Summary of Periodical Literature*, 93, 187, 284; rev. by, 177; notice by, 90
- Toland, John. J. T., France, Holland, and Dr. Williams, note by F. H. Heinemann, 346
- Tradition of Scholarship, The*, by J. F. Lockwood, noticed, 185
- Trollope, Anthony. *An Autobiography*. With an Introduction by M. Sadleir, noticed, 90
- Troyer, H. W., *Ned Ward of Grubstreet. A Study of Sub-Literary London in the Eighteenth Century*, revd., 172
- Tucker, Susie I., note by, 'Sixty' as an Indefinite Number in Middle English, 152
- Tudor Theories of History Writing*, by L. F. Dean, noticed, 90
- Ure, P., note by, 'The Statues': A Note on the Meaning of Yeats's Poem, 254; rev. by, 88
- Vinaver, E., ed. *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, 3 vols., revd., 161
- Vocht, H. de, *Everyman. A Comparative Study of Texts and Sources*, revd., 66
- Waldock, A. J. A., *Paradise Lost and its Critics*, revd., 75
- Wallis, L. B., *Fletcher, Beaumont and Company. Entertainers to the Jacobean Gentry*, revd., 74
- Walpole, Sir Robert. *Chinese Fables and anti-W. Journalism*, art. by T. C. Fan, 141
- Walton, Izaak. I. W. as Author of *Love and Truth* and *Thealma and Clearchus*, art. by H. J. Oliver, 24
- Ward, Edward ('Ned'). *N. W. of Grubstreet. A Study of Sub-Literary London in the Eighteenth Century*, by H. W. Troyer, revd., 172
- Wasserman, E. R., *Elizabethan Poetry in the Eighteenth Century*, revd., 367
- Watt, I. P., art. by, *The Naming of Characters in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*, 322
- Wells, Dr. W. C. Keats and W. C. W., note by H. W. Piper, 158
- Whitbread, L., note by, *The Hand of Æschere: A Note on Beowulf 1343*, 339
- Willard, R. See Loomis, R. S.
- Willcock, G. D., rev. by, 70, 269
- Willey, B., rev. by, 87
- Williams, Dr. Daniel. John Toland, France, Holland, and Dr. W., note by F. H. Heinemann, 346
- Williams, H., ed. *Jonathan Swift: Journal to Stella*, vol. i, revd., 364
- Wilson, R. M., (introd.) *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight . . .*, revd., 350
- Wordsworth, William. *The Poetical Works of W. W. Miscellaneous Sonnets, Memorials of Various Tours. Poems Dedicated to National Independence and Liberty, The Egyptian Maid, The River Duddon Series, The White Doe and other Narrative Poems, Ecclesiastical Sonnets*, ed. E. de Selincourt and Helen Darbishire, revd., 84; *Wordsworthian Criticism: A Guide and Bibliography*, by J. V. Logan, revd., 87; *W. und die rhetorische Tradition in England*, by K. Dockhorn, revd., 176
- Wright, B. A., rev. by, 75
- Yates, Frances A., *The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, revd., 263
- Yeats, W. B. 'The Statues': A Note on the Meaning of Y.'s Poem, note by P. Ure, 254
- Zandvoort, R. W., rev. by, 66; notice by, 185



nd  
rt.

ub-  
lon  
W.

in

ac-  
g,

ote

of  
99

nd,  
by

nal

nd

rks  
ets,

di-  
nd

ver  
her

ets,  
bi-

m:  
V.  
che  
rn,

nies

the  
re,

by,

**CURRENT PERIODICAL SERIES**

**PUBLICATION NO: 1200**

**TITLE: REVIEW OF ENGLISH STUDIES**

**NEW SERIES:**

**VOLUME: 1**

**ISSUES: 1-4**

**DATE January - October 1950**

**Notice: This periodical may be copyrighted, in which case the contents remain the property of the copyright owner. The microfilm edition is reproduced by agreement with the publisher. Duplication or resale without permission is prohibited.**

**Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan**

**MICROFILMED — 1975**

VOLUME 1 (NEW SERIES)  
ISSUES 1-4 - BACK COVERS  
MISSING.